

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2688) granting an increase of pension to George M. Linch.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment which has been agreed to will now be stated.

The SECRETARY. The amendment reported by the committee, which was agreed to, was to strike out the word "thirty," before the word "dollars," and insert "twenty."

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, what is the proposition—to make the pension \$20 or \$30 per month?

Mr. KITTREDGE. To make it \$30, as provided in the bill before it was amended.

This soldier is drawing a pension of \$17 per month under the general law. His condition is such, and especially this winter, since the bill was introduced, that upon presenting proof of that condition the chairman of the committee authorized me to make the statement which I have made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment which was agreed to will be disagreed to, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none, and the amendment is disagreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ALLISON. Are the pension cases concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the pension cases.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1904.

POSTMASTER.

INDIANA.

Charles E. Disbro to be postmaster at Greentown, in the county of Howard and State of Indiana.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1904.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Luke B. Colbert, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

To be second lieutenants in the United States Marine Corps from the 16th day of January, 1904.

William P. Upshur, of Virginia.

Lovick P. Pinkston, of Texas.

Arthur P. Crist, of District of Columbia.

Edward W. Banker, of New York.

William E. Parker, of Rhode Island.

William M. Small, of Maryland.

Epaminondas L. Bigler, of Ohio.

Robert B. Farquharson, of Vermont.

Charles R. Sanderson, of District of Columbia.

Walter N. Hill, of Massachusetts.

Tillman Bunch, of South Carolina.

Benjamin S. Berry, of Pennsylvania.

Russell B. Putnam, of New York.

Benjamin A. Lewis, of New York.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be assistant paymasters in the United States Navy from the 16th day of January, 1904.

Ben D. McGee, of Ohio.

William L. F. Simonpietri, of New York.

Neal B. Farwell, of Minnesota.

Reginald Spear, of Pennsylvania.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Pay Inspector Charles W. Littlefield to be a pay director in the Navy from the 27th day of December, 1903.

Paymaster Samuel L. Heap to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 27th day of December, 1903.

P. A. Paymaster Ray Spear to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 4th day of November, 1903.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

James E. Ballard to be postmaster at Darien, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Merton S. Buckland to be postmaster at West Hartford, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Sanford E. Chaffee to be postmaster at Derby, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Harry W. Crane to be postmaster at Wethersfield, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

INDIANA.

Edward C. Faith to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Daviess and State of Indiana.

MAINE.

Clark H. Barker to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine.

Arthur A. Dinsmore to be postmaster at Dover, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William H. Coffey to be postmaster at Tufts College, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Charles F. Hammond to be postmaster at Nantucket, in the county of Nantucket and State of Massachusetts.

George L. Minott to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Fred Slocum to be postmaster at Caro, in the county of Tuscola and State of Michigan.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

George A. McIntire to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Everett W. Greene to be postmaster at Patton, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania.

George W. Mullen to be postmaster at Dillsburg, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania.

Penroe C. Romberger to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania.

Samuel G. Wilson to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

RHODE ISLAND.

Eugene R. Phillips to be postmaster at Phillipsdale, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 26, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George J. Smith, Representative-elect from the Twenty-fourth district of the State of New York, is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will present himself.

Mr. George J. Smith came forward and was duly qualified by taking the oath of office prescribed by law.

JANITOR FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL ARTS, ETC.

Mr. HILDEBRANT, from the Committee on Accounts, reported back favorably the following resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions is hereby authorized to appoint a janitor to said committee for the sessions of the Fifty-eighth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, at the rate of \$80 per month.

JANITOR FOR LIBRARY OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. HILDEBRANT also, from the Committee on Accounts, reported back favorably the following resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a janitor to serve in the library of the House, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of \$80 per month until otherwise provided by law.

HORSES, CARRIAGES, ETC., FOR POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am directed by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to report a substitute for a resolution referred to that committee.

The following proposed substitute for House resolution 152 was read:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and is hereby, requested to furnish to this House, at his earliest convenience, a statement showing the number of horses, carriages, and automobiles maintained at Government expense for the use of officials in his Department, together with a statement showing the cost of said horses, carriages, automobiles, and harness, the date of purchase, from what fund the payment was made, and the amount of wages paid to men acting as coachmen, footmen, and chauffeurs, whether carried on the rolls as such or in some other classification; also the list of officials entitled to the use of said carriages, and the date when such service was inaugurated.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I move the adoption of the substitute reported by the committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he will accept an amendment to specify the time upon which payment of wages has been asked?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do not feel free to accept any amendment, Mr. Speaker, as I have been directed by the committee to report this substitute.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand the committee desires to obtain information sufficient to guide the House, and as the matter now stands the information obtained is likely to be almost worthless.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] moves the previous question.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Indiana had made a motion to adopt the substitute, whereupon the Speaker put the motion to the House. The gentleman from Indiana did not call the previous question and did not retain the floor. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] got the floor in his own right.

Mr. OVERSTREET. No; he asked me a question. I have not surrendered the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recollects quite well that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] yielded to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. The Chair asked the gentleman from Indiana whether he yielded, and he did yield, for a question. The Chair does not understand that the gentleman from Indiana yielded the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Is there not debate for forty minutes allowed on a motion for the previous question, if anybody wants it?

Mr. OVERSTREET. This is a unanimous report of the committee. I see no occasion for debate.

Mr. CLARK. I have no desire on earth to make a speech; but I want to know what is the rule.

The SPEAKER. If there has been no prior debate, forty minutes are allowed for debate under the previous question, twenty minutes on a side.

Mr. CLARK. Then I give notice that I should like to be recognized for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks the previous question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Indiana to withhold that—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (continuing). Long enough to answer a question that will interpret this resolution.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the previous question is voted, then will there not be twenty minutes on a side for debate?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, if there has been no debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, there has not been thus far—

The SPEAKER. The Chair states that under the rule, if there has been no debate, there is twenty minutes on a side, after the previous question is ordered, for debate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Has there been such debate on this question as would preclude the forty minutes' debate after the previous question is ordered?

The SPEAKER. That is a question of fact.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is debate now in order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that debate is not in order, for the reason that debate has been had already.

Mr. CLARK. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the fact that one Member asks another Member a question can not be construed by any fair rule as a debate.

The SPEAKER. Under some circumstances the Chair thinks he might well hold that there had been debate, where it was evidently for obstruction or dilatory purposes; but it seems to the Chair that a fair construction of the rule under existing conditions would not authorize the Chair to say that such debate had been had as to preclude debate at this time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Therefore the Chair recognizes the gentleman

from Indiana. Does the gentleman from Indiana desire recognition at this time?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will reserve my twenty minutes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska desires recognition?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy only a few moments and leave the balance of the time open to other gentlemen on this side who may desire to be heard.

When this matter came up on the Republican side of this Chamber, I was surprised, and I think many others were surprised, not so much at the extravagance and unauthorized expenditures which had been going on in all the Executive Departments, by confession, but I was surprised at the confession of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, made upon the floor of this House, that he knew that those expenditures were going on; that he knew that carriages were being illegally used and coachmen and chauffeurs and footmen illegally employed under the name of "skilled laborers," and the further confession which he made that he had been unable, when he had endeavored to do so, to procure information as to the extent of the abuse from the responsible heads of those great Departments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this presents even a greater evil than the mere evil of governmental extravagance. Governmental extravagance authorized by the representatives of the people is one thing. Governmental extravagance, however, in these Departments, unauthorized by anybody, is much worse. Not only have we had this governmental extravagance and illegal expenditure, but it was incurred and carried on without any authorization whatever, and in spite of this fact the eminent chairman of this great and powerful Committee on Appropriations has been unable either to ascertain its extent or to put a stop to it.

Extravagance of that sort is carried on in the dark, carried on under a cloud of mystery, but without the knowledge of the people and without authority from any source, a kind of extravagance that this House should stop, too, and which the people of the country will not tolerate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I introduced these resolutions, designed to obtain for this House and for the country specific information; and in the resolution which came before the House yesterday, or which should have come before this House yesterday, I asked for information as to what wages had been paid to these coachmen, chauffeurs, and footmen "during the past calendar year." The committee emasculated that resolution by striking out the period specified and laid themselves open to the suspicion—and I have no hesitation in saying it, Mr. Speaker—laid themselves open to the suspicion that they did not want to procure and lay before this House information as to the extent of the expenditures, illegal expenditures, that have been going on for the past year and longer, but desire to put the Executive Departments in a position to report simply what is existing now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a reform may have occurred. It has been intimated to me—it is, in fact, an open secret in this town—that since these resolutions were introduced there has been a rattling of dry bones and of official carriages which have been turned in and turned over and given up. This resolution in its emasculated condition will enable these executive heads of the Departments simply to report to this House what is now in existence and to conceal previous extravagance and the illegal expenditures which have been in progress during the past year.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. Your resolution contemplated obtaining information covering merely the last year—the calendar year?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. I would like to know, is it not a fact that when the information comes to the House giving the date of the purchase of these carriages, if that does not include not only the calendar year, but the whole length of time during which this has been going on; if the resolution reported does not, in fact, get more information or call for more information than you yourself called for?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will reply to the gentleman by saying that each one of these committees has reported a substitute, which does purport to seek for the additional information, which purports to ask for information as to when these carriages were purchased, and I am told that it is the evident purpose to fasten upon some Democratic Administration, if possible, the responsibility for the purchase of these carriages that have existed.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to conceal anything. I approved that part of the substitute, and I am perfectly willing to put any responsibility where it belongs, upon a Democratic Administration as well as upon a Republican Administration; but when

these committees come in here and emasculate these resolutions by striking out the inquiry for specific information as to the wages paid in the past year, then I think they have sought to conceal from this House one of the most important facts which should be revealed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am through, and if the Republican side of this House desires to take the responsibility of concealing this important matter, well and good. I have introduced these resolutions for the purpose of getting light. I reserve the balance of my time, but yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. For a question, Mr. Speaker. As I understand, the object of your resolution is to prevent anybody "standing out from under" on account of the operation of the resolution or any possible action by Congress by turning in carriages, horses, etc., and then reporting that at the time of their report they had none?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is exactly it. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, or substitute for the resolution, is in exactly the same language that was first reported to the House from the Committee on Ways and Means, calling for similar information from the Secretary of the Treasury, and the language followed by the others of the different committees which have thus far reported similar substitutes. That resolution, I understand, was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means and amended to meet the situation. To enter upon a change of phraseology in this resolution would be to call for a different kind of information from that which has already been called for from the other Departments of the Government. My understanding is that thus far the House has called for this information from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Department of Commerce, and from the State Department. If, therefore, we should modify the language of the resolution which the Post-Office Committee now submits as to the inquiry made of the Postmaster-General, I presume that the gentleman from Nebraska would assume that he had further lease of life for notoriety in seeking additional information from each of the Departments that had already been inquired of.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is this substitute not reported unanimously from your committee?

Mr. OVERSTREET. It is a unanimous report from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, at its meeting held this morning.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will you allow me one question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There was so much disturbance on the floor I could not hear. Does your substitute cover the time of the inquiry for twelve months or two years?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The substitute is in the identical language of every resolution thus far passed by the House which covers the various Departments, with possibly the exception of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then one more question. If an officer had carriages two months ago, or one week ago, and has turned them in before this inquiry goes to him—

Mr. OVERSTREET. I can answer the question more quickly by reading the resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Thank you; I could not hear it.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I read from the resolution adopted by the House yesterday, calling for information from the State Department, and I substituted the "Postmaster-General" where the resolution has "Secretary of State:"

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to this House, at his earliest convenience, a statement showing the number of horses, carriages, and automobiles maintained at Government expense for the officials of his Department, together with a statement showing the cost of said horses, carriages, automobiles, and harness, the date of purchase, from what fund the payment was made, and the amount of wages paid to men acting as coachmen, footmen, and chauffeurs, whether carried on the rolls as such or in some other classification; also, the list of officials entitled to the use of such carriages and the date when such service was inaugurated.

That means the information up to the time he received this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, pardon me. If I understand your substitute, if he has turned that carriage in he does not have to report the date at which it was bought or the cost.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course he does.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is that your construction of it?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am hardly prepared to even assume that any Cabinet officer is going to resort to a trick of that low character.

Mr. MADDOX. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MADDOX. Will you just answer a single question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do.

Mr. MADDOX. Do you construe your resolution, that is, the resolution from your committee, to cover all expenses from the time the service was inaugurated up to date? Is that the idea?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am following, or rather the committee is following, exactly the language of every other resolution thus far reported by the House.

Mr. MADDOX. I understand that.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Wait a moment. It is not, I think, fair now to frame a resolution which would be susceptible of a different construction, for this reason, if the House desires this information from the various Departments of the Government it should come to us under similar requests made of each, so that we will have the same construction on each one of the inquiries.

Mr. MADDOX. If the gentleman will permit me just a minute, I think if we can ever get order, and the Members of this House can understand what we are after, probably the trouble will be reached. What struck me was the vital question covering the idea suggested by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. OVERSTREET. My construction is this: I will say to my friend that the date of purchase will limit the beginning of the inquiry. If they have any such articles in the Department then they will report them, together with the date of purchase. I do not care how far back it goes. It relates to the articles they have at the time they get the inquiry.

Mr. MADDOX. It is not to bring along with it the expense that has occurred from that date up to this time. That is what I am after.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I presume so.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will take time enough to read the original resolution of the gentleman from Nebraska—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read for the information of the House the original resolution of the gentleman from Nebraska and call attention to the changes, and the only changes, that have been made in that resolution by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. The resolution is:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish this House at his earliest convenience a statement showing the number of horses, carriages, and automobiles maintained at Government expense for the use of officials in his Department, together with a statement showing the cost of said horses, carriages, automobiles, and harness.

Down to that point both resolutions are identically the same. Then the committee has added this:

The date of purchase, and from what fund the payment was made—

The rest of his resolution is the same—

and the amount of wages paid to men acting as coachmen, footmen, and chauffeurs, whether carried on the rolls as such or in some other capacity; also the list of officials entitled to the use of said carriages.

It will be readily seen by the Members of the House that the substitute resolution is much broader and includes a great deal more than the original resolution. It includes all that the gentleman from Nebraska called for and a great deal more. The resolution reported by the committee will, if answered, give the House far more and fuller information on the subject to which the resolution relates.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. OVERSTREET. I want to call the attention of the House to an additional amendment which further broadens the resolution. At the end of the resolution originally offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, and after the word "carriages" there have been inserted in each of the several resolutions the following language: "On the date when such service was inaugurated." So that the substitutes which have been thus far adopted by the House are much broader than the original resolutions. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask the gentleman from Indiana this question as to his own construction of the resolution as it stands. Suppose that somebody hitherto having a carriage or automobile, knowing that this inquiry was pending before the House and would be reported, were to dispose of the carriage or automobile. Then I ask the gentleman this question: Could he not then in his reply to this resolution of inquiry simply say: "January 27, 1904," or whatever date it was, "this division, or this bureau, has no carriage, has no automobile in its service, and therefore there is no date of the purchase of the automobile or carriage." Does not the gentleman think that might happen?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I answer that if that criticism should lie against this substitute, it would not only lie against each of the

substitutes adopted by the House, but also against the original resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I am not talking about the original resolution. You have in some respects made the original resolution better. The question now is whether, with the original resolution as you have made it, you can not still further better it by admitting this language and avoiding the possibility of this loophole of escape when the replies are made.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I want a minute to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question. Is not this resolution in the identical terms that it was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly; and I voted for it. I am sorry the gentleman has asked that question, because it forces me to confess in public that I had not the insight nor the foresight of the gentleman from Nebraska, who has discovered this possible loophole and convinced me that it is a loophole.

Mr. TAWNEY. The insight and the foresight of the gentleman from Nebraska happens to be the gentleman's hindsight, because the gentleman from Nebraska did not discover it until afterwards.

Mr. DALZELL. Let me ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he did not participate in the discussion and make the suggestion—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; I agreed to the resolution brought into the House from the Committee on Ways and Means at the time, and thought at the time that the resolution was broad enough, and the only suggestion I made was to broaden the original resolution which I voted for and to which I agreed.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute. The question was taken; and the substitute resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING BLANK FRANKS.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2121) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents."

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 23 of the Statutes of the United States entitled "An act providing for public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. L., p. 606), be, and is hereby amended by inserting, after the words "blank franks" where they occur in the second paragraph of section 37 of said chapter, the following words: "printed on sheets and perforated, or singly, at the option of said Senators, Members, and Delegates."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana to explain this.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The object of this bill is to authorize the Public Printer in preparing the frank slips for the use of the Senate and House to so perforate the sheets as to facilitate the addressing when the time comes to send out packages of seeds and public documents. The perforations will save a great deal of work, and the expense is practically nothing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

PROCEEDINGS ON UNVEILING OF STATUE OF COUNT ROCHAMBEAU.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following concurrent resolution No. 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution No. 4.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, and bound in the form such as is customary in the case of eulogies, 20,000 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of the Count de Rochambeau, of which 6,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 12,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,000 to be delivered to the ambassador of the Republic of France for such distribution as he shall think fit, the remaining 1,000, of which 200 shall be bound in full morocco, to be distributed, under the direction of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, to the guests invited from the French Republic and the speakers who took part in said celebration.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana why it is that the Senate, in the distribution of these documents, is given a great many more, in proportion to the number, than the House receives? The Senate gets 3,000 and the House 6,000. We have 386 Members and they have 90 members. I will ask if the committee considered that that was a fair distribution between the two Houses?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The resolution is just as it came from the Senate. That question was not raised by anyone in the committee.

Mr. TAWNEY. I think the committee ought to raise the question of its own motion for the protection of the Members of the House in getting their share of the public documents.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] that this is not an unusual division. The division is somewhat arbitrary, and in the case of distributions previously made I understand this rule is followed.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman if it is not done on the theory that Senators have a very much larger constituency than Members have, individually?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I should say that possibly that has something to do with it. The same distribution has been followed, Mr. Speaker, in similar publications provided for by the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I would like to offer an amendment. I have no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, but I will offer an amendment placing the number to be distributed or placed to the credit of the Senate at 2,000 and the number to be placed to the credit of the House and the House document room at 7,000.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7 strike out the word "three" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Also, in line 8 strike out "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seven."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

TREATIES, LAWS, AND ORDERS RELATING TO INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 452, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Treaties, Laws, Executive Orders, etc., Relating to Indian Affairs," as revised, 300 of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 800 for the House of Representatives, 200 for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 50 for the House Committee on Indian Affairs, 50 for the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and the remaining 1,100 shall be sold by the Superintendent of Documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

CHARLES CARROLL AND JOHN HANSON.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound of the proceedings in Congress upon the acceptance of the statues of Charles Carroll of Carrollton and John Hanson, presented by the State of Maryland, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Maryland.

The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall procure suitable copper-process plates to be bound with these memorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask if the chairman of the Committee on Printing will not consent to an amendment to this resolution changing the ratio of numbers of copies for distribution between the two Houses, so that there will be 3,000 for the use of the Senate and 12,000 for the use of the House?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I have no objection to accepting the amendment, but I wish to say in this connection that this is the usual distribution which is made of documents of this nature.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand that it may be usual in concurrent resolutions which originate at the other end of the Capitol, but it is not the rule as to distribution which the House has heretofore followed; and if it were there is a very good reason why that rule should now be changed, because the House to-day consists of 386 Members, whereas heretofore it consisted of 356. I move,

therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution be so amended as to provide 3,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 12,000 for the use of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7 strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."
Also, in line 8, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelve."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER-GENERAL OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed in paper covers, at the Government Printing Office, 5,500 additional copies of the annual report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for the year ended June 30, 1903, with illustrations, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 2,500 copies shall be delivered to the Bureau of Immigration for distribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution which has just been reported?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS, a motion to reconsider the several votes by which the several resolutions were passed was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the urgent deficiency bill. Before we go into committee I desire, if possible, that we may agree upon a limit for general debate. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I should like to know whether points of order have been reserved on this bill.

Mr. HEMENWAY. There have been.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest we should like about two hours on our side.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, I ask unanimous consent that there be five hours of discussion on the bill in the Committee of the Whole, two hours and a half on a side, the time of the majority side to be controlled by myself and on the minority side by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] asks unanimous consent that general debate in Committee of the Whole on this bill be limited to five hours, one-half of that time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. HEMENWAY, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, it was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. TAWNEY in the chair) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10954) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for prior years and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] is recognized.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, before referring to the provisions of the bill which I bring before the House, I want to call attention to the condition of the Treasury of the United States. It is well in the affairs of Government as well as private affairs to take occasionally an account of stock and see "where we are at."

In view of different statements made by Members of this Congress in which legislation is suggested upon the ground that we have a large surplus in the Treasury, I think it my duty to call the attention of the House and of the country to a real problem that we are called upon to solve. It is this: How can we reduce the estimated expenses of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year \$42,000,000?

The total estimates submitted at the beginning of this session

for ordinary expenses, exclusive of \$56,500,000 required to meet the sinking fund, amount to \$727,474,206.79.

In addition, more than ten millions in the nature of supplemental estimates have come to the Committee on Appropriations by reference of the House. Those that have gone to other committees and still more that will follow that will come to Congress before the session closes will surely increase that sum at least \$15,000,000. The arbitrary cut made in the Engineer's estimates for contract work on rivers and harbors, which will probably not be sustained if the contract obligations are met, amounts to \$4,843,716. Adding these sums to the original estimates makes a grand total of \$747,317,922.79.

The total revenues are estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next at \$704,472,060.72. Estimates in excess of the probable total revenues, \$42,845,862.07.

The problem is all the more serious when we realize that at the last session Congress appropriated, exclusive of deficiencies, within less than \$10,000,000 all that was submitted in the estimates, and that at the first session of the last Congress—the session corresponding to the present session of this Congress—the appropriations, exclusive of deficiencies and the large sum of \$50,130,000 for the isthmian canal, approached the sum of the estimates within a little less than \$24,000,000.

Nor is there any comfort afforded in the fact that the total estimates, excluding the sinking fund, submitted last Congress were at the first session thereof \$19,672,311.53 less than the estimated revenues, and at the last session \$44,310,887.70 less than the estimated revenues.

It only argues that we now have no latitude to appropriate beyond the lines laid down in the regular estimates, and that those lines must of necessity be materially contracted. Three of the great annual supply bills for the Government—the pension, legislative, executive, and judicial, and the army—have passed the House. They carry in the aggregate \$242,006,123.35, nearly one-third of the whole annual estimates, as presented to us by the Executive. Yet they show a reduction in the sum total of only \$4,116,623.26 under those estimates. If the ratio of reduction is not materially increased when we come to consider the remaining bills, the expenses for the next fiscal year, as we shall authorize them, can only be met by heavy inroads on the surplus in the Treasury.

The present net cash balance in the Treasury amounts to \$224,000,000. This sum is likely to be materially diminished in the near future (1) by payment on account of the isthmian canal, \$50,000,000; (2) by requisition on account of unexpended balances of appropriations, which are: For increase of the Navy, \$27,000,000; for rivers and harbors, \$37,000,000; for public buildings, \$17,000,000; total, \$131,000,000.

Thus, if all outstanding obligations fixed by appropriations already made were liquidated the net cash in the Treasury would be reduced to the dangerously low-water mark of \$93,000,000, a sum less than it has reached at any period since the era of depression that antedated the beginning of Mr. McKinley's first Administration.

There yet remains to be appropriated to meet contract obligations authorized chiefly by the last Congress on account of public works, as follows:

For increase of the Navy	\$82,718,659.00
For rivers and harbors	36,628,964.89
For public buildings	17,161,609.34
Total	136,509,233.23

The estimates of appropriations required to be made at this session on account of the foregoing are:

For increase of the Navy	\$38,226,860.00
For rivers and harbors (engineers' estimates)	13,540,753.00
For public buildings	9,037,208.00
Total	60,804,821.00

There should be no legislation passed reducing revenues, and this Congress must exercise economy, not refusing any necessary item, to meet the growing expenses of this great country, but to strike from the estimates and from the appropriation bills reported to this House every superfluous item. We must keep within the revenues.

Now, gentlemen, I desire to call attention to the bill that has been presented to the House. It is something more than an urgent deficiency bill; we have made it general in its character, in that it provides for all ascertained obligations of the Government for the current and prior fiscal years. For instance, judgments of the Court of Claims, judgments of the courts generally, and accounts that are audited and ascertained by the different departments of the Government. All have been taken care of on this bill.

We are urging certain legislation upon the bill. It is, of course, subject to a point of order, and can only go through by the unanimous consent of the House.

The first item is legislation authorizing the Government board

of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition to rent certain buildings in the city of Washington. It seems to be necessary in getting together the different Government exhibits that they should have certain rooms in the city of Washington. The general statute prohibits the renting of any buildings in the District of Columbia without express authority of law. So we put that item on the bill authorizing these buildings to be rented.

We next propose the following:

The President is hereby authorized to establish convenient districts for the collection of revenue from customs, and for that purpose may subdivide any State or Territory within or appurtenant to the United States, or may unite two or more States or Territories within or appurtenant to the United States, or any part or parts thereof, into one district, and may from time to time alter said districts: *Provided*, That there shall be no more than 123 collection districts.

We have to-day in the United States about 165 collection districts. Many of these districts are maintained at great loss to the Government. I will put in the RECORD a statement taken from page 25 of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which shows these districts that are maintained at a loss to the Government. For instance, at Elizabeth City, N. C., we have a port, the receipts of which last year were \$87. It cost the Government \$1,770 to maintain that district. We have at Brownsville, Tex., a district, where the receipts last year were \$4,700 in round figures, and it cost the Government \$31,000 to maintain the district. We have at Galena, Ill., a district, where there was collected 70 cents last year—

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will directly. It cost the Government \$378 to maintain that district; and so all along the line, in the last year, and from year to year, are given the amount collected and the amount it cost to maintain the port. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. What do you propose to do with reference to these offices?

Mr. HEMENWAY. What do we propose to do in the matter?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Have you any suggestion in your bill?

Mr. HEMENWAY. We propose here by the bill to legislate substantially in the same manner as was done in regard to the internal-revenue collection districts in 1877. Years ago the same condition existed in the Internal-Revenue Service. They had numerous unnecessary collection districts all over the country, and provision was placed upon an appropriation bill authorizing the President of the United States to combine the districts and limit the number they should have in the United States. Under that legislation the districts were combined and many were discontinued.

The service is reputed to be to-day the best administered and least expensive branch of the public service. The internal revenue is collected, collected promptly, collected easily, at a very light expense, and there is no reason why the customs should not be collected in the same way. The Secretary of the Treasury, quoting again from his report, pages 109 and 110 to 113, gives tables showing that \$230,740,925 of internal revenue was collected during the last fiscal year with 1,314 employees, at a total cost of only \$4,771,188.50, or a little over 2 per cent on the dollar. During the same period there was collected in revenue from customs \$287,784,499; the service cost \$8,464,558.14, or more than 3 per cent on the dollar, and employed 6,358 persons.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Would you still have your officer at each one of these small ports?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Where it was necessary there would simply be an officer there in charge, as you have now. You have your stamp agencies—

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Your deputies.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Your deputies. For instance, in the State of Indiana there used to be quite a number of districts—I think five or six—for the collection of internal revenue, and in each district was a separate organization employing many persons. That has all been done away with. We have now two districts, and at each important point of the State—

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Your proposition would not then close these ports; or would your proposition close these ports?

Mr. HEMENWAY. It would not close a single port of the United States that is necessary. The effect would be in such places we would not have a high-salaried Presidential officer and a great army of clerks; they would have simply a deputy, with a sufficient force to transact the public business.

Mr. MADDOX. And it would consolidate some of them?

Mr. HEMENWAY. And it would consolidate some of them. As I have stated, this item is subject to a point of order, but I do not believe that Members of this House will make a point of order against an item that will result in such a great reform.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provision contemplates a very great change for these offices, does it not?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Oh, certainly it contemplates a great change in the offices.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Probably the most comprehensive legislation on this subject that would be enacted in years?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is the most comprehensive legislation on this matter that has been enacted or will be enacted in some years.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, as I understand it, there has been no legislation upon the question since 1872, except to add to the number of collection districts. I want to say to the gentleman that it is almost impossible to agree upon legislation upon this matter. When you try to get a bill that will specify points all over the United States it is a very difficult thing to agree upon it. Members of the House looking after their particular districts or their particular territory insist that that port should be here or there, so that it is much better to leave the whole matter, as was done in the case of the collection of internal revenue, to the officer in charge to simply put the port where it is absolutely necessary. We have had experience along this line in the collection of internal revenue and it has worked well. It was started just as this has started, the item being in almost the exact language.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Has there been any effort made to agree upon such a bill as the gentleman refers to?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Oh, I can not say as to that. I judge there has been, as this evil has existed for many years, and it is reasonable to believe that efforts have been made to agree upon a bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to ask the gentleman if he believes that legislation of such important character should be ingrafted upon an appropriation bill?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do in this instance, because there is no better place to put it, and we have had, as I say, an example in the result of the legislation placed upon an appropriation bill in regard to the collection of internal revenue. We have so thoroughly demonstrated in that department that it can be done that there is no danger in following the same legislation in regard to the collection of customs. Nearly all remedial legislation of this character has had its origin and abiding place on appropriation bills, a recent notable instance being the abolition of the fee system for United States attorneys and marshals, that was accomplished on an appropriation bill and has resulted in the saving of many millions of dollars to the country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me, this bill was reported to the House last Saturday?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A copy of the bill or of the report was unavailable until yesterday to the Members, and now the gentleman urges Members of this House to favor this provision of the bill and reads from a report to which no attention is called in the report from his committee, and it seems to me that it is unfair to the Members of this House to ask them to pass upon such important legislation in this way.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I read from the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which was sent to the different Members of Congress, and they have certainly had it in their possession for the last month, I should say, or six weeks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all; about two weeks.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do for a question.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. In your judgment, will this change in any way affect the commercial interests of our country to their detriment?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Not in the least. At every point where it is necessary to have a port I have no doubt there will be one, in charge of a deputy or in charge of a collector; but it will result in this, that a great many ports which are unnecessary, as it can be shown by this report, will be abolished and less important ones will be consolidated. Why should a collection port exist that turns in only \$5.19?

Mr. BARTLETT. How much does it cost to collect that?

Mr. HEMENWAY. In one instance, \$236. In many instances it is a great deal higher than that. There is one point where it costs, if you take the report, \$136 to collect \$1, and there is another place where it costs \$540 to collect \$1.

Here is another place where it costs \$540 to collect a dollar; another where it costs \$258 to collect a dollar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. There are no great comprehensive changes connected with this legislation, but it is of great importance in the line of economy?

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is all.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. How much will it reduce expenses to make these changes? Has the gentleman made any estimate of that?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The estimate is about \$100,000 a year, and they think they can save more than that.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Has the gentleman any detailed statement showing where it will come in?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The detailed statement contains the number of unnecessary ports to be dispensed with. We have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, which I will put into the RECORD, and which goes into it in detail.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Is there any place where there is a collectorship to-day that it would not be necessary to have a deputy collector in case you abolish the collectorship?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Where?

Mr. HEMENWAY. If the gentleman wants me to go into detail, I can only give him my opinion, and it might not be of any value. I refer him to the list printed on page 25 of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the gentleman can figure out the places where the ports ought to be discontinued.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. If you discontinue a collectorship and it is necessary to appoint a deputy under the civil service, will it not in many instances entail a larger expense rather than a smaller expense?

Mr. HEMENWAY. No; there is not a single instance where it would entail a larger expense, but in every instance the expense will be reduced.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. My own impression is that there are places where it would cost more.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not think there is a place in the United States where it could possibly cost more.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Is it always a fair method in determining the necessity of a collectorship to take the amount of revenue collected as compared with the cost of collection?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Not always. At certain great ports of the United States where inspectors are necessary the amount collected does not always determine the importance of the port, but at interior ports it always determines the importance of the port.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I have the honor to represent several hundred miles of coast and interior line, and there are three or four collectorships along that line. I do not know but one—that is Machias—where it costs more than the receipts. I think none of the others cost more than their receipts. One of them, Bangor, is the largest collector of revenue in the State. Now, along that line it is necessary, for the prevention of smuggling, as there are several railroads that cross the line, to have deputy collectors and inspectors, whether you have a collectorship or not.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Let me say to the gentleman that there are seven ports in Maine where the revenue collected amounts to less than the expenditures.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I would like to ask the gentleman if Machias is one of them?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Belfast is the first one in the list.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. That is not in my district.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman can get the list from page 25 of the Secretary's report.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not want to vote for any such radical change in existing law without I carefully look into it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman will have ample time to do that.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Very well.

Mr. MADDOX. Isn't it true that these subports that the gentleman is talking about have added largely to the expense of collection of the revenue of the country? Does not the Assistant Secretary say himself that these expensive ports from which we receive no revenue have created these deficiencies that the gentleman is asking for in this bill? His testimony seems to be pretty full in this report, which it seems the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has not discovered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Georgia misunderstood what I said. The statement of the Assistant Secretary is in the report, but the list of places that the gentleman from Indiana was reading from to the committee is not in the report. That is the information upon which he is basing his argument.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The table from which I read is in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, on page 25. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the hearings, showing the

difference in the cost of the collection of customs and that of internal revenue. The percentage of cost of collecting the customs is one-third more than it is for the collection of internal revenue.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman read the list.

Mr. HEMENWAY. It is too long to read, but I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I was absent from the room at the beginning of this discussion. I understand the question was asked whether any attempt has ever been made to remedy this state of things.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The question was asked, and I could not answer it.

Mr. PAYNE. In 1898 Mr. Gage, Secretary of the Treasury, reported these matters fully and in detail, and that report was sent to the Committee on Ways and Means. Afterwards there was a hearing had there in reference to those matters, and we endeavored to frame a bill; but because of the opposition there was to it we did not succeed in agreeing upon any bill to cut off any ports; we did not succeed in bringing in any such bill. Secretary Shaw also made a recommendation in his report to this Congress. The matter was brought up at the last meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means and a direction made for further investigation of the subject.

There is no doubt but that some of these ports ought to be cut off. They cost a good deal of money. I think one port collected 70 cents when the cost of collection was three or four hundred dollars. Some of them are inland ports, and, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] has well said, there is no excuse for keeping up the inland ports where the cost of collection is more than the revenue. There is more excuse for a seaport, because very often the collector there is able to prevent smuggling. The question arises whether all of that business could not as well be done by a subcollector as by a collector with a full corps of officials. I believe myself it is a matter which ought to be thoroughly investigated and that some bill ought to be brought before the House remedying this. It is a useless expense in a great many cases, and it is an exorbitant expense in other cases, and where, if the ports are not cut off, a subport might be made, with a much smaller force and with a great deal less expense.

Of course the members of the committee will readily see that where there are ports scattered along the seacoast in which vessels may enter there is danger of smuggling unless a United States officer is about; but a deputy collector at a subport can prevent smuggling just as well as a collector with a larger salary and a whole corps of officials. The collectors in some of the small ports receive more salary than the deputy collectors to-day.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Oh, not always.

Mr. PAYNE. No, I think not; but it is not gauged on the amount collected, else some of them would not receive more than a dollar of salary during the whole year.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. The object of a port is to prevent smuggling at that particular port.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; at some of the small ports. I think perhaps at most of these places along the seacoast there should be a subport, but there is no use of a full army of officials to look after smuggling.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I am very confident that there are many ports in Maine where the current expenses are less than they would be if a deputy collector were sent there under the civil-service rules.

Mr. HEMENWAY. These same men would stay there as deputy collectors.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Their pay would be very much enlarged.

Mr. BURKETT. They would not have to do it under this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. The House can regulate the pay by legislation.

A large portion of these were cut off before.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. The pay of deputy collectors is about the same—four or five dollars a day.

Mr. PAYNE. The pay of a collector is, of course, greater than the pay of a deputy collector.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Not at all.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think the comparison between the collection of customs and internal revenue is hardly fair as to the amount of expense. On account of the larger revenue from customs the percentage would not be so much larger, as the gentleman indicates, and then the two branches of the service are so entirely distinct that it is not fair to compare them. The collection of the internal revenue is so much more easily gotten at in a great many instances that I do not think that comparison is quite fair.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would ask the gentleman if ports and subports are not established by act of Congress?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, they are.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The provision under consideration does

not authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to abolish any ports or subports, but it provides that he may consolidate customs districts, and if a district with a port were consolidated with another district that port would become a subport by operation of law or by act of the President, would it not? What would be the status?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not noticed the provision in this bill, but when the matter was presented in 1898 the Treasury Department drew a very elaborate bill, and in that bill established and reestablished ports and subports all over the United States, of course eliminating some of these smaller ports, where the expense was so large in proportion to the collection, and placing ports where the Secretary of the Treasury thought there ought to be ports. I have sent for that report of the Secretary of the Treasury, but they do not seem to be able to find it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This bill has a provision giving the President a broad discretion to rearrange and consolidate districts throughout the country without limitation, providing that there shall be no more than 123 collection districts altogether.

Mr. PAYNE. I would be glad to have that provision of the law read.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will read it:

The President is hereby authorized to establish convenient districts for the collection of revenue from customs, and for that purpose may subdivide any State or Territory within or appurtenant to the United States, or may unite two or more States or Territories within or appurtenant to the United States, or any part or parts thereof, into one district, and may from time to time alter said districts: *Provided*, That there shall be no more than 123 collection districts.

The gentleman will notice that this gives the President unlimited power to consolidate and reorganize, but there is no authority, of course, to close a port or to change a port from the status of a port to that of a subport, because that status is fixed by act of Congress, as I understand.

Mr. PAYNE. I should doubt very much whether that provision would remedy the evil. We have now before the committee a proposition to establish some subports in the State of Washington and also a recommendation by the Secretary of the Treasury to remove the principal port from Port Townsend to Seattle, both in the same customs district. We are met by a portion of the Representatives from that State who desire that the old port at Port Townsend, where there are about 2,500 people and a very small quantity of imports—1 or 2 per cent of the whole amount—continued, instead of being transferred to Seattle, where over 50 per cent of the imports are received, so that there would be an obvious saving to the Government on the transportation of the money that goes to the subtreasury at San Francisco by placing the port where the commerce is. This is a matter which it seems to me ought to have most careful investigation, and a bill in regard to it should be carefully framed.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I should like to ask the gentleman another question. I see by looking over the list of those ports where the cost of collection is more than the amount of revenue received that the cost in thirteen of them is considerably less than \$1,000 and at some less than \$500. Now, if a collectorship is necessary where the Government receives but \$1,100 or \$1,200—

Mr. PAYNE. I think the aggregate of cost, at least as shown in the report for 1898, if not the present report, was some \$150,000, while the amount collected, if I remember rightly, was only \$10,000 or \$12,000. I would not be absolutely sure about the amount; but it cost perhaps ten times as much to make the collections as the amount collected.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. But if an officer is necessary at those points, would you decrease the cost any by this arrangement?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not wish to trespass on the time of the gentleman from Indiana, who, I understand, has disposed of a portion of his time, so I will not interrupt him further.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have called attention to this item now. When we reach it on the bill, I shall ask, if necessary, for more than five minutes of discussion—say two hours or whatever time may be necessary. My object in calling attention to it now is that the House may have an opportunity to look the matter over while the general discussion goes on.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What is the item?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The item for the consolidation of collection districts, on page 13.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? I notice it is here provided that there shall be no more than 123 collection districts. Can the gentleman tell us how many collection districts there are now?

Mr. HEMENWAY. One hundred and sixty-five.

Mr. BOWERS. The gentleman, a few moments ago, in stating the cost of collecting internal revenue as compared with the cost of collecting customs duties, stated that it cost 33½ per cent more to collect the customs than the internal revenue. I take it the gentleman is aware that there is performed in every custom-house a large amount of services for American vessels for which no

charge is made to the vessel, the expense being paid by the Government, and going to make up, in the smaller ports, the salary of the collector.

Mr. HEMENWAY. In the Internal-Revenue Department many inspectors are necessarily employed, and yet their services result, apparently, in no direct collections for the Government.

Mr. BOWERS. I understand that; but the inquiry I desired to make was whether the cost of these services rendered to American vessels and paid by the Government has been added as a part of the salary of the collector.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the next item of legislation on this bill. It is in regard to the public building at Macon, Ga. It appears that on the site purchased there there is a lively stable which can be converted into a building that will be all right for the post-office, thus avoiding the necessity of paying rent on another building. We have authorized certain repairs to that building, so that the post-office may be moved into it while the new one is being constructed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not think the gentleman has stated exactly the conditions under which this appropriation is to be made.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then I ask the gentleman from Georgia to make a statement of the matter, as he is familiar with it.

Mr. BARTLETT. In 1900 and 1901 there were appropriated regularly for rent of temporary quarters \$5,000 in one year and \$6,000 in the other. After the appropriation had been made Congress increased the appropriation for the building there, and that made it necessary to buy for the purposes of the site additional land adjoining the present site. Upon that site there is located a building which, if properly put in order, would answer all the purposes of a post-office and save the Government at least \$4,000 a year. This appropriation merely authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use money already appropriated for the purposes of temporary quarters, so that the Government can get its quarters more cheaply than it otherwise could.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman has stated the substance of this change.

On page 50 of the bill we recommend this:

That hereafter no part of any money appropriated shall be used in payment of per diem compensation to any clerk for attendance in court, except for days when the court is actually in session opened in the presence of the judge, which fact shall be certified in the approval of the account.

That is to correct an abuse that now exists, where a clerk will keep a court open and put a little entry on the docket each day, keeping the court constantly open in order to draw \$5 per diem. This practice evidently was not contemplated at the time the law was passed, and it is certainly an abuse, and we seek to remedy it.

The next item is:

That the payment to officers and men severally entitled of the judgments, herein appropriated for, of the Court of Claims for bounty for destruction of enemy's vessels, under section 4635 of the Revised Statutes, be made on settlements by the Auditor for the Navy Department in the manner prescribed by law and Treasury regulations for the payment of prize money, the distribution of such individual share to be in accordance with the orders, rules, and finding of the Court of Claims.

And hereafter in all cases of final judgments and awards rendered against the United States by the Court of Claims, and of final judgments rendered against the United States by the circuit and district courts of the United States, payment thereof under appropriations made by Congress shall be made on settlements by the auditor for the Department or branch of the public service having jurisdiction over the subject-matter out of which the claims arose.

Under the Dockery law or present accounting system they have to be paid through the Auditor's office for the State Department, and there is every reason why they should be paid through the Auditor's office from which they went.

Now, there is just one other item on this bill to which I desire to call attention, and then I shall be through with my statement. That is the item of mileage.

At the extra session of Congress there was reported from the Committee on Appropriations a resolution making the mileage then appropriated for available for the extra session.

A similar resolution was offered in the Fifty-third Congress by Mr. Holman, who was then the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The mileage was made available and was paid for attendance on the extra session. At the regular session which followed, Mr. Hayes, of Iowa, offered on the floor of the House an amendment for mileage of Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories, \$130,000, for the second session of the Fifty-third Congress.

To that, Mr. Wells, then a Member of Congress, made the point of order. There was a long discussion, which finally resulted in a ruling by the Chair, in which the Chair held that the point of order was not well taken, and that the amendment was in order on the bill, that it was an appropriation authorized by law.

In the Fifty-fifth Congress there was an extra session, and the same procedure was had; a joint resolution was passed making the mileage available for the extra session of Congress, and at the following regular session an item passed upon the appropriation bill without debate, no one raising any question against the item

in the House, providing for mileage for that regular session of Congress.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations, following the precedents laid down by the Fifty-third Congress and the Fifty-fifth Congress, and following the ruling of the Chair in the Fifty-third Congress, report in this bill an item for mileage, and simply say to the House, "Now it is up to you." We have followed the precedents laid down in the Fifty-third and the Fifty-fifth Congresses. Under our construction of the ruling in the Fifty-third Congress and of the action of the Fifty-fifth Congress, this mileage is authorized by law. In fact that was the exact point passed upon by the Chair in the Fifty-third Congress, and we have put it on the bill. The House can determine whether or not they want to accept the mileage.

I will say in addition to that that the other question arises which is made by some gentlemen, that this is one continuous session of Congress; that there has been no adjournment of the special session of Congress. That is a question which the House must determine for itself; but the Committee on Appropriations bring this item in here for the consideration of the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. Following the law.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and will print as a part of my remarks the following.

[From report of the Secretary of the Treasury, page 25.]

List of ports at which customs expenses exceed receipts.

Name of port.	Receipts.	Ex-penses.	Num-ber em-ployed.	Cost of collect-ing \$1.
Albemarle (Elizabeth City), N. C.	\$87.00	\$1,770.67	2	\$20.35
Apalachicola, Fla.	1,913.61	3,513.63	4	1.83
Barnstable, Mass.	729.43	4,107.16	7	5.63
Beaufort, N. C.	13.01	1,775.12	2	133.44
Beaufort, S. C.	761.41	3,585.32	4	4.70
Belfast, Me.	2,738.80	2,985.45	6	1.09
Brazos (Brownsville), Tex.	4,732.77	31,991.11	26	6.75
Bridgeton, N. J.	292.60	1,437.38	5	4.91
Bristol and Warren, R. I.	103.61	254.15	2	2.45
Burlington, Iowa	52.67	441.80	1	8.38
Burlington (Trenton), N. J.	4.80	162.00	2	33.75
Castine, Me.	1,808.85	4,542.55	6	2.51
Chattanooga, Tenn.	27.73	388.70	2	14.01
Cherrystone (Cape Charles City), Va.	30.00	956.80	3	31.89
Eastern (Crisfield), Md.	737.00	2,824.20	2	381.64
Edgartown, Mass.	534.64	2,538.18	4	4.74
Frenchmans Bay (Ellsworth), Me.	982.37	3,827.49	5	3.89
Galena, Ill.	.70	378.05	1	540.07
Georgetown, S. C.	32.27	485.42	2	15.04
Gloucester, Mass.	7,611.24	18,489.65	14	2.42
Great Egg Harbor (Somers Point), N. J.	1,890.84	2,045.19	3	1.08
Humboldt (Eureka), Cal.	1,491.64	2,874.18	1	1.92
Kennebunk, Me.	6.47	114.32	2	17.66
La Crosse, Wis.	13.80	362.00	2	26.23
Machias, Me.	1,212.44	4,290.43	5	3.53
Michigan (Grand Haven), Mich.	5,132.42	8,886.69	14	1.73
Nantucket, Mass.	15.70	396.20	1	23.32
New London, Conn.	1,278.83	4,911.44	5	3.84
Pamlico (Newbern), N. C.	1,324.50	5,891.50	5	4.44
Pearl River (Shieldsboro), Miss.	7,914.93	9,177.84	6	1.16
Plymouth, Mass.	786.06	1,455.10	2	1.85
Rock Island, Ill.	22.08	775.14	2	35.10
Saco, Me.	87.35	482.26	2	5.52
St. Marks (Cedar Keys), Fla.	300.05	1,523.59	2	5.07
St. Marys, Ga.	2.44	581.90	1	238.48
Salem and Beverly (Salem), Mass.	5,308.96	6,117.19	6	1.15
Sandusky, Ohio	2,359.28	4,377.55	9	1.85
Southern Oregon (Coos Bay), Oreg.	10.00	1,308.92	2	130.89
Teche (Brashear), La.	109.21	3,036.43	3	27.80
Vicksburg, Miss.	26.20	547.55	1	20.89
Waldoboro, Me.	4,026.75	7,459.87	7	1.85
Wheeling, W. Va.	880.55	1,529.90	2	1.73
Wilmington, N. C.	4,760.43	6,720.12	5	1.41
Wiscasset, Me.	966.94	3,388.96	3	3.50
York, Me.	5.19	236.87	1	45.44

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 18, 1904.

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
House of Representatives.

SIR: As requested by the committee, your attention is directed to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903, page 25, in which reference is made to forty-seven ports where the cost of collection of \$1 exceeds \$1. Attention is also directed to pages 110, 111, 112, and 113 of the same volume, which show in detail the customs business of the country. It will be observed that the average cost to collect a dollar is \$0.0394. By reference to the table on page 109 of the same volume it will be found that the average cost to collect a dollar of internal revenue is \$0.021.

With the data available in the Treasury Department at the present moment, no satisfactory plan of consolidation of districts to reduce the cost of collection per dollar of customs receipts can be recommended, nor in the light of past experience is it deemed advisable to suggest a detailed and arbitrary reorganization of customs districts. In the first session of the Fifty-second Congress Mr. Harter, on January 12, 1892, introduced a bill authorizing the consolidation of customs-collection districts, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, but never became a law. It provided specifically for a reorganization of the customs districts. A copy of the bill is inclosed herewith for the information of the committee.

Previous to 1876 there were 183 internal-revenue districts. In 1876 and 1877 legislation now appearing as section 3141 of the Revised Statutes was enacted. Through its operation the number of internal-revenue districts has been re-

duced to 63, and the cost of collection steadily lowered. Section 3141 of the Revised Statutes reads as follows:

"For the purpose of assessing, levying, and collecting the taxes provided by the internal-revenue laws, the President may establish convenient collection districts, and for that purpose he may subdivide any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or may unite two or more States or Territories into one district, and may from time to time alter said districts: *Provided*, That the number of districts in any State shall not exceed the number of Representatives in Congress to which such State was entitled in the Thirty-seventh Congress, except in such States as were entitled to an increased representation in the Thirty-eighth Congress, in which States the number of districts shall not exceed the number of Representatives to which any such State was so entitled: *And provided further*, That in the State of California the President may establish a number of districts not exceeding the number of Senators and Representatives to which said State was entitled in the Thirty-seventh Congress."

The act of March 3, 1877, limited the maximum number of internal-revenue collection districts to 126, and that limit still exists, but has never been reached. That portion of the act bearing on the subject is as follows:

"From and after the 30th day of June next there shall be no more than 126 collection districts; and it shall be the duty of the President, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to reduce the internal-revenue districts to not exceeding the number aforesaid in the manner heretofore provided by law."

This was a provision following an appropriation for salaries and expenses of collectors in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878.

It is respectfully suggested that authority similar to that given in section 3141 for the consolidation and reorganization of internal-revenue districts be given to the executive department of the Government for the consolidation and reorganization of customs districts. It is further suggested that a provision to this effect, carrying such authority, might properly be inserted in the urgent deficiency bill now under consideration before your committee. In this connection it is suggested that the permanent appropriation for the collection of customs be increased from \$5,500,000 to \$8,000,000. This, together with the estimated amount which will probably be received from miscellaneous receipts, would make a sum sufficiently large to cover the estimated expenditures; and with a proviso that any unexpended portion of the appropriation shall be covered back into the Treasury there will be no necessity for a deficiency appropriation of any kind. In the meantime, if authority be given to the executive department to reorganize the districts, undoubtedly a considerable saving could be effected and the various districts of the country put on a business basis, the cost of each one being apportioned on a basis commensurate with its business.

If such authority is granted to the Department, there is no probability of the absolute abolition of independent ports. Scores of places, however, which are now independent ports would be made subports, attached to some principal port which is now self-supporting, and placed in a customs district which is now self-sustaining. The receipts of all the small ports would thereafter be consolidated with the receipts of the larger port, and the expenses reduced to those absolutely necessary to transact the business in a satisfactory manner.

At each of the subports a sufficient force would be retained to conduct the business and police the territory to which they are assigned. The reorganization of the districts would be in the interest of commerce and importers, inasmuch as a chief customs officer of experience would be in charge of all the ports of the district and the practice would be uniform. Many errors arising at small ports that are now brought to the attention of the Department too late to correct would be eliminated entirely.

Recent data relative to the workings of the immediate-transportation law are not available to the extent of showing the proportion of the immediate-transportation business compared with the ordinary business of the port. The item of cost due to the extension of the immediate-transportation provision to ports where no business is done is inconsiderable for the reason that no additional help is required when no additional business is transacted.

Respectfully,

R. B. ARMSTRONG,
Assistant Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves the balance of his time. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield sixty minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia yields sixty minutes to the gentleman from Alabama, who is recognized for that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I should say anything on this bill were it not for the fact that I am a member of the subcommittee that reported it, and I desire to make a few statements to the House as to my views on the items contained in the bill.

Among other things that the subcommittee examined into at the time of the hearings upon the bill was the question of carriage hire. A number of heads of Departments were before the committee and testified in reference to the use of carriages in the Departments. The testimony showed that some of the carriages used in the Departments were very necessarily and properly used. There was other testimony going to show that carriages were used by persons for their private use that were not used for the benefit of the Government, and that they were unnecessary.

I think that the whole testimony taken together demonstrated one fact very clearly. That is that a system has grown up in the Government departments and bureaus in Washington and in Army and Navy post stations away from here, of allowing heads of departments and officers to use the contingent funds allowed to them by Congress for other purposes for the purchase and maintenance of carriages and horses for their own private use at Government expense; that is not necessary and is improper. I do think, however, that there are certain cases in which the officers of the Government ought to be provided with carriages. For instance, take the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretaries of State. A real part of their official functions is to make calls and answer calls of foreign diplomats, and to attend certain

diplomatic functions. They are paid a very small compensation, and I think it would be entirely proper for the Government to furnish them with carriages and horses.

But, on the other hand, from the testimony it seems that the heads of certain bureaus have been using private carriages and maintaining them out of the contingent fund provided by Congress for other purposes. I think that is all wrong. But it has grown up to be a custom, and I think there is but one way of getting at it and remedying the evil, and that is for Congress expressly—not for the Appropriations Committee, for we have not the jurisdiction in this matter, but for the House, which has jurisdiction of the case—to pass a specific law saying that no fund appropriated for contingent expenses shall be used to maintain private carriages, or public carriages for that matter, of Government officials, and then by express law state what officials of this Government are entitled to have carriages and appropriate for them, for the pay and maintenance of carriages and horses as provided by law, and stop the indiscriminate use of the contingent funds that are appropriated for other purposes.

In the bill there is another item that I think it necessary to call to the attention of the House, and that is an appropriation of \$100,000 put in this bill that is not of necessity an urgent deficiency. It is \$100,000 to survey the Alaskan boundaries. As Members know, that question has been in dispute for many years. The tribunal selected has finally decided that question, has ordered a survey made and certain monuments erected. The more quickly it is done, the better. If we wait for the regular appropriation bill, it would be several months before the work begun. Therefore the committee saw proper to put an appropriation in here of \$100,000 in order that the survey might commence at once.

Then there is an item in here, a rather large appropriation, for the diplomatic service in Panama. It is an item proposing to pay the minister of the United States at Panama a salary of \$10,000 a year, and appropriates for his salary for the balance of the fiscal year—that is, up to the 30th of June, 1904. Now, I want to say that I voted for that appropriation in committee, and shall vote for it in the House. The reason that I voted for it in the committee and shall vote for it in the House is this: The President of the United States has appointed Mr. Buchanan minister to Panama. The Senate of the United States has confirmed that action. He is a governmental officer duly and properly commissioned, fulfilling his functions as representative of the United States at a place where, at the present time, it is very necessary for us to have an able and active officer to look after the affairs of the United States, regardless of what we may think as to the action of the President or the Executive in reference to the Panama revolution.

In view of the fact that this man was properly appointed, confirmed by the Senate, and that we need a diplomatic officer there, I voted to pay him his salary. The reason we fix \$10,000 as his salary, which may seem to be a large salary for a diplomatic officer in so small a country, was this: The testimony before the committee showed that Panama was an exceedingly unhealthy place; that a great many of our consuls-general had died there, and, as one witness said, part of it was salary and some of it, a large part of it, was life insurance.

And under these circumstances the committee did not believe that a salary of \$10,000 was too large in order to get an intelligent and able and efficient Government agent at that place.

Now, in reference to the item for the collection of customs revenues, the chairman of the committee has stated the action of the committee in bringing in an amendment in this bill that is subject to a point of order under the rules of the House, but it is evident that it is an amendment that is very badly needed. The Secretary of the Treasury has shown that under the present system of collecting revenues from customs it costs something like 3 cents and 4 mills to collect each dollar of customs revenue, whereas, on the other hand, it only costs 2 cents and 1 mill to collect the internal revenue.

Some years ago it cost just as much to collect the internal revenue as it does to collect the customs revenue now, but a law was passed through Congress authorizing the President of the United States to consolidate the revenue-collecting districts. By that means economy was created. The cost of collecting this revenue was cut down to a total cost of 2 cents and 1 mill to a dollar. Now, the Secretary of the Treasury asks for a deficiency appropriation of \$2,400,000 on this bill—a deficiency appropriation. When he is asked, Why is this large deficiency, and why he can not collect this money at a less expense, he says because the existing law requires him to keep revenue collectors at certain ports where the expense to the Government is greater than the revenue collected; but he states that he is bound by the law; that he must obey the law, and therefore he can not reduce the cost of collection, and for that reason he asks for this amendment to be passed in order that the President may consolidate the ports of entry. Change full ports into subports, and thereby economize

and reduce the cost of collection, and he intimates that he can probably cut it down somewhere in the neighborhood of 2 cents on the dollar, as he has the internal revenue, and save the Government something over a million dollars in the collection of its revenue.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrupt the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama—because I am interested in this item, as one of the ports of entry of my district might be affected—does the Secretary of the Treasury or does the committee suggest any particular ports of entry or customs districts which are to be abolished or consolidated?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I am particularly interested in the ports at Beaufort and Newbern, N. C., and I trust there is no possibility under this legislation that these ports will be consolidated with any other port or placed under deputy collectors, because they are important ports and old ports and customs districts and have been in existence for many years.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman from North Carolina this legislation can only pass by unanimous consent of every man in this House.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. In other words, the item is subject to a point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is subject to the point of order, but I say it is wise to let it stay in this bill or in some other way to enact it, because clearly it is costing more money to collect our revenue than it ought to cost, and the reform is needed. I will read to the gentleman just what the law proposed is:

The President is hereby authorized to establish convenient districts for the collection of revenue from customs, and for that purpose may subdivide any State or Territory within or appurtenant to the United States, or may unite two or more States or Territories within or appurtenant to the United States, or any part or parts thereof, into one district, and may, from time to time, alter said districts: *Provided*, That there shall be no more than 123 collection districts.

Now, I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina, that is exactly what Congress did when it passed a law in reference to the collection of internal revenue and authorized the President to consolidate districts. It would be a very difficult thing for Congress to pick out the districts to be consolidated, because we are all naturally looking after our own. If the question came up here of consolidating a port in my district or in yours or one in another, we would soon have a combination here where we would all vote to save our own ports, and therefore vote as a unit against the bill, not that we care for the other ports, but to protect ourselves, so that no legislation could be passed.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. There may be possibly ports of entry that ought to be abolished in the interest of economy, but when it comes to the ports of entry in North Carolina, such as Beaufort, Newbern, Wilmington, Elizabeth City—few in number, but important—certainly these ports ought not to be abolished. [Laughter and applause.]

If this item is subject to a point of order, then I shall be compelled to make the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman tell us how much salary is paid to the customs officer at the various large ports in the United States—say New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not recollect them, and my time will not permit me to go through it. I will refer the gentleman to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury contained in House Document No. 269, which will give him that information.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am familiar with the comparison between the cost of collection of customs and that of internal revenue, but I thought we might economize by cutting down some of these salaries at the large ports of the country. I understand some of them are as high as \$20,000 and some \$30,000. It seems to me that we ought to begin this economy at the top rather than to go out into the woods and into the little places around in the country and close ports in this summary way.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama what amount the Secretary estimated would be saved by this provision?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Secretary of the Treasury did not estimate the exact amount, but in his testimony before the committee he intimated that by this change he could probably cut down the cost of collection to what it cost per dollar to collect the internal revenue, which would be a saving of about 1½ cents on a dollar, amounting in the total to about one million and a half dollars.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That would still leave a deficiency of \$900,000 on the regular appropriation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; in relative figures it would, although it is just to say that there has been a deficiency on this appropriation since 1872. Congress has adopted the custom of making an annual appropriation of \$5,500,000 for the collection, and then put the balance in the deficiency bill. So there really has been a deficiency all the time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Has the gentleman at hand the deficiency for the previous year?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The deficiency for 1903 was \$2,300,000. The estimated deficiency for this year is \$2,400,000. It has been growing for many years, and will continue to grow unless some reformation is made in the collection of these revenues. The Committee on Appropriations admit that this is not within their jurisdiction; that this legislation is not in order if objected to. Any man can knock it out on a point of order, but when we considered the need of holding down expenditures, and the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended this legislation, we felt that it should be presented by the committee of the House, either for them to act now or hereafter, as the House deems proper.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is not aware that in all these collection districts, both where there is a full collector and a deputy collector, these officers have various services to perform in connection with the licensing, registering, and enrolling of vessels and the changing of masters, and that this proposed amendment of the law contains no provision for the appointment of deputy collectors? Is not the gentleman aware that great inconvenience will result?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from North Carolina misunderstands the amendment. This amendment provides that the President shall have authority to create ports into subports. Of course a subport will carry the same number of officers it has now. If the President thinks, in his discretion, that a port ought to remain a full port, it will have all the men that it carries now. If he thinks it only needs the officers of a subport, why he will make it a subport. In other words, he combines not only the ports, but he combines these collection districts where they have the immediate right of transportation, where a great deal of unnecessary expense is now created.

Mr. SMALL. At any point where a deputy collector exists now it will rest in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury or the President whether that shall be continued as a port or a subport?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Unquestionably.

Mr. SMALL. Is it not true that in any of these subports great inconvenience will be created in connection with the service to American vessels if they should be abolished?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend that I have no doubt that the people of every town in which a full port is located would object to having it made a subport. Of course in every actual port on the seashore, I take it, the President would not abolish the station entirely. He might reduce a full port to a subport. I take it further that the people living in a place having a full port now, if it was reduced to a subport, would feel that they had been done a great hardship; but that would not make it wrong; somebody must exercise the discretion.

This House ought itself by a bill reduce the number of ports and reform the matter, or they ought to give the Executive the right to reform it. Now, the committee does not say to the House you must reform it one way or the other, but we simply say that the executive officer of this Government, the Secretary of the Treasury, has said that he could not economize under the present law, that the law must be changed, and that he asked for some authority to change it so that the cost of collection can be reduced, and he suggests this provision of the law. That is all.

Mr. SMALL. Now, I want to illustrate to the gentleman from Alabama what an injustice this may entail.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina not to do that for my time is running. I am glad to answer any question, but the gentleman can make his speech in his own time.

Mr. SMALL. Very well. I want to say that I do not think the committee has thoroughly considered this question.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman who argues that there should be a change in the law why he or some member of this committee does not bring in a bill for that purpose if they are convinced of this fact, and not undertake to make the change in this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have just stated to the House that this committee simply reported to this House what the Secretary of the Treasury said was necessary. We call the attention of the House to the fact that it is not in order on this bill, that it can not come in here except by unanimous consent. If the unani-

mous consent of every Member of this House is given, then it is all right to have it here. If the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] does not think this legislation ought to be had on this bill, when the question is reached he ought to rise in his seat and take the responsibility of killing it, as he can do.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman think that the legislation that is incorporated in the bill is sufficient and broad enough to cover the question in its entirety?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I can not say that myself from my own knowledge. The Secretary of the Treasury seems to think that it is. The committee did not go into a very full investigation of the question. It is not the business of the Appropriation Committee to do so, but it was our business when the matter was called to our attention, and we were told that we could not economize unless there was some legislation to enable them to economize, to report those facts to the House, and that is all this committee has done.

Mr. HERMANN. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to ask him a question. Is it not a fact, under the present reorganization system of the collection districts, that in all those districts where there are full collectorships and the receipts are small the salary paid the collector is so small that the services could not be performed for any less compensation, even by a deputy?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend is asking me something I know nothing about except as I get it from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury in his report in 1903—and it will be found on page 35—reports that there were some fifty-odd ports that were not paying, costing more to maintain than they collected, and that they ought to be consolidated. I do not know. It is a technical question. I will say candidly that I am not informed on the subject.

Mr. HERMANN. In my own State—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, I will ask my friend not to make a speech in my time.

Mr. HERMANN. Just one remark further. In my own State there are two collection districts where the entire receipts, I presume, do not equal one-half of the compensation that is paid the officers employed to supervise the collection; and yet at the same time the maximum compensation does not exceed \$100 a month—a compensation for which you can not obtain the services of any person, let him be known as a collector, a deputy, or even as a clerk.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know nothing about that.

Mr. HERMANN. There could be no reform in abolishing such collection districts as those.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know nothing about that fact.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat, I would like to have him call attention to such matters in the bill as are matters of new legislation and subject to the point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will. Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say on the question of the collection of customs revenue. I will endeavor to call attention to the other matters of new legislation in this bill, as suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The first item of new legislation is the question of authorizing the board of commissioners of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition to hire rooms in this city.

In reference to all other expositions heretofore the commissioners have been allowed to take out of the general fund of their appropriation money for the purpose of hiring storerooms and offices in the city of Washington to enable them to assemble the Government exhibits. The Comptroller of the Currency has recently held that under the last appropriation they can not use any of that money for that purpose. That will be found on page 3 of his report.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much money does it take?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a general provision allowing them to use so much as may be needed for that purpose from the funds already appropriated. It is simply to enable them, out of the appropriation already made of \$800,000—the Comptroller having held that they could not use any of that—to secure rooms in which to assemble exhibits before shipping them away. Then comes a provision to allow the Government to rent a building in Macon, Ga., to be used as a temporary post-office while it is tearing down the old building and rebuilding another one, which provision is proper and necessary.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the gentleman makes a mistake when he says it is to permit the Government to rent a building. It simply permits the Government to use the money already appropriated for rent to repair its own building and put it in shape so that it can be used for a post-office. I do not think it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, we put it in the bill as new legislation, but there is no reason in the world why the Government should not be allowed this privilege, and I suppose nobody on earth will object.

Mr. BARTLETT. It saves the Government \$4,000 a year for two years.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The committee shows it will be a saving to the Government, and it is necessary for these people to have some place in which to conduct their post-office business while the new building is being constructed.

The next provision of new legislation is this: A deficiency appropriation was asked for by the Department of Justice for per diem for clerks, and, as shown by the testimony, it was a rather large deficiency. We called for a statement to show the cause of this large deficiency, and it seems that when the courts are not in session, if a judge enters an order at his place of residence and sends it to the clerk to be entered on the docket of the court, the clerk can charge the Government \$5 a day for each day that he enters one of these orders, regardless of whether the court is actually in session or not. In other words, if the judge at his home makes a half dozen orders and sends them down to the clerk to be entered up, the clerk can enter one each day and claim that the court was open on each day, although there was neither judge nor jury in attendance and nobody there but the clerk, who receives \$5 a day for doing so. At the suggestion of the Department of Justice, the committee have inserted in this bill a provision that will hereafter prevent this practice. And the same provision was made to apply to the district court in the District of Columbia.

Those are the questions of new legislation arising on this bill, unless the provision for the payment of salary to a minister to Panama be regarded as new legislation (and the committee did not so regard it) and unless the provision in this bill for mileage be regarded as new legislation. The majority of the committee did not so regard it, although I do.

Another provision to which I think it proper to call the attention of the House is the appropriation of \$131,500 by way of deficiency for the Marine Corps. This deficiency was created by the necessity, or what the President determined was the necessity, of sending a number of marines to Panama—a provision for their traveling expenses, necessary supplies, etc., down there, which have been used from funds that would have been available to carry the Marine Corps through the balance of this fiscal year. It left a deficit; and unless we make an appropriation now, there will not be funds available to maintain that corps for the balance of this year. So that the committee felt it necessary under these circumstances to make this appropriation in order to maintain the marines until the 1st of July next.

Then we come, Mr. Chairman, to the question of mileage. I want to state that I differed with my colleagues on the committee as to the legal status of this proposition. The committee reported the bill to the House with the understanding that every member of the committee should be at liberty to take whatever position he thought proper on this question. Most of the members of the committee came to the conclusion that the existing law is that Members of Congress shall receive this mileage. Those members hold that we have had two sessions of Congress, and that, whether it was right or wrong for us to receive the mileage for November, the law requires that it should be paid now and that it was necessary for the committee to report it, as it was carrying out existing law.

Mr. Chairman, I differed with my colleagues on that proposition, because I contend that there has been but one session of Congress. If we had had two sessions, then I admit the question would come before Congress as to whether we should take the money or not—a question for every man to determine for himself. But if we have had but one session of Congress, if the session in which we were engaged in November is the same session in which we are now engaged in January, then there is no rhyme or reason, technical or ethical, why we should appropriate \$145,000 for mileage for Members of Congress.

Now, I do not intend to tire you with a long argument on this question, but I think it is but justice to myself and justice to the House to state my views, as I hold them, in reference to this question.

I contend that under the Constitution of the United States a session of Congress can come to an end in but one of three ways: First, we can adjourn, under the Constitution, by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses; second, we must necessarily adjourn when the end of the term for which we were elected arrives on the 4th of March, and, third, when the two Houses differ as to whether they want to adjourn or not then it is within the discretion of the President to adjourn us to such time as he may see proper. All this is provided for in the Constitution of the United States, and these are the only means by which the two Houses can adjourn under the Constitution of the United States when they have once assembled.

That is practically admitted by all up to that point. But the gentlemen who say we have had two sessions of Congress say that that is true, that a regular adjournment by the action of

Congress can be had only in that way, but that the Constitution provides that you must meet on the first Monday in December every year in regular session, and that when that time comes you have got to start a new session.

Now, if that is so, of course we have had two sessions of Congress, but if it is not so we have not. Now, what does the Constitution say?

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year. Such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

What is the intention of that provision? Congress shall assemble at least once in every year. Is not that the governing clause in the sentence? The writers of the Constitution intended that we should be here at least once every year, but they did not make it binding on a particular day. They appointed that day provided we did not choose to assemble on some other day; but if we are already assembled, where is there any violation of the Constitution in remaining assembled? There is no reason why we should adjourn. The object was not that we should create a new session of Congress and start in on a new term on the first Monday of each December, but the object of the Constitution was to have us in session at least once every year. We could change the date and order the session to begin in August, if we wanted to, and there would be no compulsion on our part to meet here on the first Monday in December. I say, therefore, there is no authority given by the Constitution, or given by Congress, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of this House to declare the two Houses adjourned and then call them together again.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, if I were alone in this proposition, if it were a new question, I might have some doubt upon it. It might be open to some such construction. But I have taken the trouble to examine into the precedents in the past and I find that the Second Congress of the United States, in its second session, met on the 5th day of November, 1792, and remained in continuous session until March 2, 1793; that it passed by the first Monday in December, and that not one single word was said by any Member of that Congress about finding an infinitesimal space of time between 12 o'clock noon on the first Monday in December of that year and 12 o'clock noon on the first Monday in December of that year that divided the session of Congress under the Constitution. Not one word was said about it. Many able and distinguished men constituted that body.

I find that there were among the membership Roger Sherman and Charles Ellsworth, of Connecticut; Charles Carroll and William Pinckney, of Maryland; Fisher Ames and Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts; Rufus King, of New York; Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina; Robert Morris and Frederick A. Muhlenberg, of Pennsylvania, and James Madison and James Monroe, of Virginia—all distinguished men, many of them signers of the Declaration of Independence or members of the original Constitutional Convention. But none of those men when that momentous first Monday in December arrived found that there was an infinitesimal space of time in which one House could adjourn one session and start another in order that the Members of the Congress might receive mileage for the purpose of riding on the street car down to their hotels and back again. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But that is not all. The Third Congress of the United States in its second session assembled on the 3d day of November, 1794, and continued in session until March 3, 1795. The Fifth Congress met in its second session on November 13, 1797, and remained in continuous session until July 16, 1798. The Sixth Congress in its second session started on November 17, 1800, and remained in continuous session until March 3, 1801.

The Eighth Congress in its first session started on October 17, 1803, and remained in continuous session until March 27, 1804. The Tenth Congress assembled on the 26th day of October, 1807, and continued in session until April 25, 1808. The second session of that Congress met November 7, 1808, and remained in session until March 3, 1809. The Eleventh Congress met in its second session on November 27, 1809, and remained in session until May 1, 1810. The Twelfth Congress met in its first session November 4, 1811, and remained in continuous session until July 6, 1812. The second session of that Congress met on the 2d of November, 1812, and remained in session until March 3, 1813. The Thirteenth Congress met on September 19, 1814, and remained in session until March 2, 1815. The Fifteenth Congress met in its second session on November 16, 1818, and remained in session until March 3, 1819. The Sixteenth Congress met in its second session on November 13, 1820, and remained in continuous session until March 3, 1821.

Every one of these Congresses I have named met before the first Monday of December and was in session on the first Monday of December; and among all the line of distinguished men that occupied seats in the House and Senate of the United States during these Congresses not one single man arose in his seat or even

thought there was an infinitesimal space of time that made it necessary for the Congress to adjourn, so that we would be authorized to appropriate \$145,000 for mileage. Not a single man in all those years, in all those Congresses, believed that it was their duty to assemble a new session of Congress on the first Monday in December when they were already in session.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama if it is not a fact that in 1857—I do not know whether the gentleman has carried his investigation down that far or not—that not only the House, but Congress, passed a law and enacted it into law, providing that on the first day of each session of Congress in each and any succeeding session, whether regular or called, that the Members of Congress should be paid on demand mileage?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I have not examined into that question. The gentleman seems to have done so. I have no doubt he is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. I call the gentleman's attention particularly to the fact that in 1857 Congress, both the Senate and House of Representatives, passed an act, which was approved by the President, in which it is especially provided that every session, beginning with the first, without reference to how many there might be, but on the first day of every session Members should be paid their mileage upon claiming it. And is it not true that that continued to be the law down to 1866?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend has evidently investigated this question and is familiar with it. But whether they paid themselves mileage or not has nothing to do with this question as to whether we have had one or two sessions. The law now very distinctly says we shall be paid for each regular session. If we have been in session since November down to the present time, if it has been one continuous session, there certainly is no reason at all for the payment of a second mileage.

I want to say that when you come down to the Fortieth Congress we find that that Congress assembled in extra session on March 4, 1867, and remained in session until December 2, 1867, at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes, when by concurrent resolution of the two Houses they adjourned, and they met ten minutes afterwards in another session, and they received but one mileage for the two sessions.

The point that I make is that the Members of that Congress believed it took the united action of the two Houses by a concurrent resolution to adjourn them. I find in the Forty-fifth Congress that they met on October 15 and ran up to December 3, and a few minutes before noon on that day they adjourned by concurrent resolution, and then were again called together in regular session. I have gone through the Journals of every session of Congress since the beginning of the Government in which there were extra sessions. We have had sessions that overlapped the first Monday in December, and among the many distinguished men that were here not one of them ever called attention to the fact that they were compelled to adjourn and meet again when the first Monday in December was reached, or that the presiding officer of the Senate or the Speaker of the House could adjourn them without action by the House and Senate.

Now, I say that is the law, and if this question is ever presented to the courts of this land it will be so decided. Of course it can not be on the mileage question, because we are the sole judges of that. If we were to vote ourselves \$10,000 apiece and the President of the United States will sign the bill, we could do it, and there is no check on earth except public sentiment. But if this question ever comes before the courts of this land—and it probably will with reference to the salaries of some of these appointees of the President who are awaiting confirmation—I have no doubt in the world the courts will decide that there has been but one continuous session of Congress since we assembled here in November. Now, if that is so, there is no reason in the world for the payment of this money.

There is no reason or law that I know of for any gentleman to contend we ought to have this mileage. Congress has not gone home. If we had adjourned and gone home and come back, I think the main object of the law regardless of technicalities would have been carried out, and the people contemplated when they elected us to pay our way here to Washington and to pay our way back again for ourselves and for our families, if we had adjourned long enough to go home. Some of the members may have gone home on private business or political exigencies may have carried them home, but the Congress of the United States was here; the Congress of the United States was here assembled; it was assembled at five minutes to 12, noon, on the first Monday in December, and the same Congress was assembled at noon on the first Monday of December of that day, and no fiction, such as the Speaker leaving the chair and calling the House to order again, would change that proposition and the law.

Mr. THAYER. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. THAYER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, his contention is that there has been, then, no lawful adjournment of the extra session up to this hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. Now, whether you call it the regular session or the extra session, we are and have been in continued session.

Mr. THAYER. If the President called an extra session that everybody on earth knew was an extra session, why should we not have pay whenever that ends, if we are also in regular session—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we had pay for the extra session and we had not been home and come back to earn any other pay—

Mr. THAYER. Then we should have no pay for the regular session; is that the gentleman's contention?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say that we have been paid for this session of Congress, whether you call it extra or regular, whenever each one of us receives one mileage, and that is all we are entitled to.

Mr. THAYER. That is for the extra session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I do not care whether you call it extra or regular.

Mr. THAYER. What do you call it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I simply call it one mileage for one session of Congress. That is all we are entitled to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think if the gentleman will examine the law he will find we have already received mileage for the regular session. In other words, it was worded so as to anticipate the mileage of the regular session to let it be paid then.

Mr. THAYER. Well, I have not got mine for either yet, and I should like to have both. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. My friend is very candid about it, and I believe many would like to have it if it is proper.

Mr. THAYER. I think I am entitled to it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If one regular session of Congress ran into the second session of Congress, so that it was a continuous session, do you claim that because Congress was constantly in session no mileage should be paid?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I most certainly do, because, I say, mileage is granted for a specific purpose—that is, to take you and me home and to bring us back here. If we do not go home and come back, we are not entitled to be paid.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Say, though, the law provides that Congress may select a time for its regular session, which regular session ran into another, you claim there should be but one mileage for the entire Congress?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say if we met the 5th day of March and stayed in continuous session until the 4th day of March two years afterwards, when we adjourn by law, we would be entitled to but one mileage, because the reason for which the mileage is awarded would not have taken place; that is, neither you nor I would have gone home. We may have gone home on a political exigency; we may have gone home to attend to some political affairs; but as Members of Congress we would not have returned home to our constituency, because Congress had not adjourned.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. What I wanted to get at was your idea of the law. Now, you claim, as I understand you, notwithstanding that the law says there shall be a session of Congress on the first Monday in December, if one should meet on the first Monday in December in one year and continue past the first Monday in December the next year, there would be but one session of Congress, and not two sessions of Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I unquestionably say that, and the authorities I have cited vouch for it. Not one Congress, but a number of Congresses have passed the first Monday of December and made no claim that there was a new session, and made no claim for mileage.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am not speaking of whether they made any claim, or whether they were entitled to a second mileage. Did they not always treat it as a new session?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly not, and I have cited instances. A dozen or fifteen Congresses down to the present time have gone along on, and their Journals have shown that the session began in October and ran until May, and it was simply the first session of that Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. So I understood the gentleman; but the matter has never been decided because the facts have never existed before. The law provides for two regular sessions, one commencing the first Monday of December, and, if Congress continued

in session after the time fixed for its second session, the gentleman holds that it is still the first session of Congress?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Unquestionably; there is no law otherwise.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama, because he has investigated this matter, is it not true that there never was an appropriation for mileage for the extra session so nomine; was it not always the case that the resolution was introduced to make the mileage for the regular session immediately available?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And is it not true that we have already been paid the mileage of the regular session?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; if this is the regular session, we have been paid the mileage. But this is only one session; the Speaker had no power on earth to adjourn it. It was only ourselves by concurrent resolution that could do so. If the Speaker of the House could adjourn us, then we could violate the provision of the Constitution that says that we shall not adjourn for more than three days without the consent of the Senate. The form that we went through in the House and in the Senate was merely a form, and nothing but a form. The fact that the Journal is dated the second session of this Congress means nothing but mere form; and I have no doubt that the courts of this land will determine ultimately that we have not had but one session, and then, if it appears that we have voted ourselves two mileages, and taken two mileages at one session of Congress, I say it would put us in an embarrassing attitude, and one that I am not willing to remain in.

I do not intend to criticize my colleagues' action in this matter. They are just as fair men as I am; they are just as conscientious men as I am. They are just as capable of determining what is right and what is wrong as I am, but, for myself, I claim the privilege of voting against this resolution because I do not believe that I am entitled to two mileages; and I want to say that if you pass this resolution for two mileages I do not propose to take mine, but to allow it to be covered back into the Treasury on the 1st day of next July.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to understand the gentleman's position, because I am in sympathy with him. We met in extraordinary session on the 9th of November. Now, suppose we had adjourned by concurrent resolution on the 20th of November and gone home and came back here on the first Monday of December. What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would say then, under the law, that we had applied the mileage for the regular session for the first session. There would have been two sessions of Congress, and we might vote ourselves another mileage because we had been home and come back.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Could we do so under the law, according to the gentleman's construction? Suppose on the 20th of November we had gone home and come back to the regular session in December.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we had not taken the December mileage in November, the law would carry it to us. But we have already been paid the mileage. We made the December mileage available to us in November, and we ought not to vote ourselves a new mileage. You passed a resolution in this House making the mileage that was due to us on the first Monday in December available and payable to ourselves in November.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. But suppose we had adjourned on the 20th of November and gone home, paid ourselves for the session, for the extra travel, and then came back on the first Monday of December, would we be entitled to a second mileage according to the gentleman's own construction?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There might be good reason if we went home and came back. I would be willing if I went home, if the extra session adjourned, and I was put to the expense of coming here with my family and taking them home, I would be perfectly willing to take it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. But the view of the gentleman is that, not having adjourned at all and going right along in this continual session, we are not entitled to our mileage.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We are not entitled to pay ourselves two mileages for one session of Congress.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. As a matter of fact we all know that Congress was here, that the Members were all here—certainly presumptively here—and we did not go home at the end of the extra session, but begun this regular session the following Monday—the first Monday in December. Now, should we in equity—I hope not in law, because I am utterly against this mileage proposition—should we as a matter of equity to ourselves pay ourselves the extra mileage when we were already here when Congress met in regular session, under the Constitution, December, 1903?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend what I have just

said, that so far as the equity is concerned I have decided that I shall vote against the bill, and if my brother Members of Congress pass it, that I will not take the mileage, but that it can be converted back into the Treasury.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That's right.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the decision I have reached as to the equity in the matter, but I decide for no one but myself, and I have as high regard and respect for the decision of other Members of Congress in that respect as I have for my own, and I would not in any way reflect on any other Member of Congress because he looked at the question from a different attitude from mine.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. If the gentleman is correct in his contention about the law, he certainly is correct in his conclusion that we ought not to take the mileage. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I will ask that the gentleman be permitted to have five minutes longer.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentleman five minutes' time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. We want to get a correct understanding of the law so that we may act intelligently. If I understand the gentleman, his contention is that there has been but one session of Congress up to this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is it.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. And there being but one, there ought not to be but one mileage paid.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Now, I call his attention to this section of the Constitution:

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different date.

Now, Congress has not by law appointed a different date. The Constitution, therefore, fixes a particular time when the regular session of Congress must commence. As a matter of proper legal interpretation of the Constitution and of the law, is it not evident from this provision that if the President called a session of Congress previous to the first Monday in December that this called session must, by operation of the Constitution itself, expire on the first Monday in December regardless of the passage of a concurrent resolution to adjourn by Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Evidently my friend was not here when I discussed that phase of the question.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I did not hear you, and I should like to hear now what the gentleman has to say about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not go through the full discussion. If my friend is interested in it, he will find it in the RECORD in the morning. I will say this: The position I take is that the object of that provision of the Constitution was merely to require that Congress should be in session at least once a year; that if it was already in session then the provision of the Constitution had been complied with. More than that, I cited numbers of instances of Congresses from the Second Congress down to the present day where they had met before the first Monday in December and had gone on in continuous session without anybody regarding that it was necessary to adjourn on the first Monday of December; where no one found that there was an infinitesimal space of time which required the adjournment of the two Houses, and where this question was not raised. It was considered one continuous session from the fall until the early spring.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Due to the fact that the question was not raised.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That may be true.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. And even if all that were true, does that afford an answer to the contention that the express provision of the Constitution requires the Congress to enter upon a regular session on the first Monday in December? We are now in the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress. The first ended December 7, when the second, by the Constitution, began. The House and Senate recognize this fact and so dates the records.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend interprets the Constitution from a different standpoint. I contend that the governing sentence in that clause is that Congress shall be in session at least once a year, and to insure that the Constitution fixes a date, unless it is otherwise fixed. I say that under the law, when the President fixed a different date and we remained in session until the first Monday in December, then the provision of the Constitution was complied with, as shown by all the precedents in the matter.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I make these suggestions to my friend only in order that we may discuss this matter together to see if we can reach a conclusion. I, however, differ very radically from the gentleman on the question of law involved and the construc-

tion of the Constitution, as is apparent. The President has no control of the meeting of Congress at its constitutional sessions.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is it not a fact that in the case where Congress met in 1867 that was distinctly without the rule that would apply here, because Congress met in pursuance of a specific law and not at the call of the President at that time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the first meeting of Congress in 1867 took place on March 4.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is it not an historical fact that owing to the differences that existed between Congress and the President the date for the meeting of Congress was fixed at that time by law, not by proclamation, and that under an act of Congress the Congress convened in extraordinary session?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I believe my friend is right.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. So that Congress did not meet in December, under the terms of the Constitution, but under the law which had fixed the date of the meeting.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But when Congress came to meet in December, for some reason—I do not know what—they wanted to adjourn and start a new session. It was not done for the purpose of drawing mileage, because the Congressmen did not take two mileages that year. But they did adjourn by concurrent resolution on the 2d day of December and met again on that day.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As a matter of fact, the time of the meeting of Congress had been changed by a law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is true. But take the Forty-fifth Congress, in 1877—

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is not a precedent, because they met in pursuance of law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Fortieth Congress is not a precedent, then the Forty-fifth certainly is, when the Congress met regularly on a regular call by the President, as we did at the extra session in November last, and ran on until the 3d of December, when they adjourned by concurrent resolution (recognizing that a concurrent resolution was required) and then met again. In that case they did not adjourn for the purpose of claiming mileage, because the Members at that time accepted only one mileage.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3341. An act authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, title 3, of an act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome City, in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 540. An act providing for additional officers in the district of Chicago, in the collection district of Indiana and Illinois;

S. 2081. An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1681. An act to provide for the modification of the project for the improvement of Bridgeport Harbor, Bridgeport, Conn.;

S. 2261. An act to amend section 4607 of the Revised Statutes;

S. 901. An act providing for the construction of a vessel of the first class for the Revenue-Cutter Service, to be stationed with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii;

S. 1748. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California;

S. 469. An act to restore Henry D. Hall to the Revenue-Cutter Service;

S. 1319. An act authorizing Robert A. Chapman, of Alabama, his associates and assigns, to use the waters of the Coosa River, in Alabama, for the purpose of generating electricity;

S. 462. An act to construct and place a light-ship off the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga.;

S. R. 9. Joint resolution authorizing the issue of duplicate medals where the originals have been lost or destroyed;

S. 906. An act to aid in the erection of a statue of Commodore John D. Sloat, United States Navy, at Monterey, Cal.;

S. 23. An act for the erection of a monument to the memory of John Paul Jones;

S. 131. An act to provide for the construction and equipment of a revenue cutter for service in Narragansett Bay and adjacent waters;

S. 1280. An act to provide for a site for a depot for the Revenue-Cutter Service;

S. 492. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington;"

S. 711. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, and making appropriation for the same;

S. 1490. An act to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota;

S. 708. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to authorize the building of a bridge across Thief River, in the State of Minnesota;

S. 270. An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.;

S. 352. An act for the relief of the representatives of M. F. Merritt, deceased;

S. 175. An act for the relief of Robert D. McAfee and John Chiatovich;

S. 177. An act to reimburse certain persons who expended moneys and furnished services and supplies in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities within the territorial limits of the present State of Nevada; and

S. 334. An act for the relief of N. F. Palmer, jr., & Co.

The message also announced that the Senate had nonconcurrent in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1760) granting a pension to Ann A. Devore, had asked for a conference with the House on the bill and amendment, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. BURTON.

The message also announced that the Senate had nonconcurrent in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 200) granting an increase of pension to Austin Almy, had asked for a conference with the House on the bill and amendment, and had appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. FOSTER of Washington, and Mr. TALLAFERRO as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1334) granting a pension to Amy C. Bosworth.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the alert, resourceful, and aggressive leader of the other side of the Chamber, has several times during this Congress characterized the devotion of the Republican party to the principles of protection as a sort of idolatry. He has been joined in this charge by other Members of the minority. His distinguished colleague, the scholarly gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who has just submitted an able argument to the House, in the course of the carefully written speech which he delivered some days ago charged that the Republicans were still wedded to their idols. And again the gentleman from Mississippi said that those of us who regard the Dingley tariff bill as a wise and beneficent measure were fetich worshipers. Now, there is something sinister about the sound of that word "fetich." It smacks of barbarism and superstition. Let me suggest, however, to the gentleman from Mississippi that those who worship in glass temples should pull down the blinds.

But inasmuch as he and those of his political faith seem to glory in the performance of their fantastic rites with the shutters of their sanctuary wide open, they will not be surprised if we direct the attention of the country to some of their wild ceremonies. And I trust they will not be embarrassed if I ask some of them in the course of my remarks whether these weird rites conform strictly to the rubric of the Democratic missal of Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland.

Now, Mr. Chairman, about eight years ago the Democrats of this country, the political children of Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland, were carried away in captivity. By the waters of the Platte there they sat down; yea, they wept when they remembered Bryan, for he was their Nebuchadnezzar. After the captivity King Nebuchadnezzar set up a graven image 30 cubits high, and he made it of silver. It had a great white, senseless face, and it was so constructed that it could repeat with ceaseless, senseless iterations the silly words "Sixteen to one." [Laughter.] Then the edict went forth that "at what time ye shall hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all other kinds of music, ye shall fall down and worship the graven image which I have set up. And those that fall not down shall be cast into a burning, fiery furnace." [Laughter.]

You all know the cornet—that strong wind instrument. King Nebuchadnezzar himself took the cornet. And you know how the other instruments were distributed. My friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], whose genial face usually looks at me from his

accustomed seat, certainly played the harp. With his seraphic countenance he could not play anything else than that heavenly instrument. And his colleague from Missouri on the Rules Committee [Mr. DE ARMOND], from the name of the instrument, must have played the sackbut. I never saw one, but I know it has a doleful sound.

But my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], beyond all doubt, with that silver eloquence of his, performed his part on the dulcimer. And the chorus struck up. And then what happened? You all fell down and worshiped—five millions of you or more worshiped. Worshiped! You gentlemen who taunt us with idolatry worship, you simply squirmed and groveled on your marrowbones before that white, senseless idol. You wore holes in the knees of your intellectual trousers. You wore the toes off your moral boots that ought to have been used in spurning from your presence that white, senseless monstrosity of political paganism. Then when you got up you thought of the fiery furnace, and you thought with glee of the stubborn and stiff-necked ones that were going to be consumed there, and you got up off your marrowbones just long enough to gather around the burning, fiery furnace.

And lo, what happened? Well, we all know. There was Shadrach Olney, and Meshach Whitney, and Abednego Carlisle, walking around there in the burning, fiery furnace, just as cool as cucumbers [laughter], lighting their cigars on the coals and getting up a scheme to sell out the burning, fiery furnace to the steel trust. [Laughter.] And when they came out, without a singe on their hair or the smell of fire about their garments, one of the disgusted stokers of the burning, fiery furnace called out to the king, "Hey, Neb, where did you get your bum idol?" [Laughter.]

Well, then a great rock that was not made by the hand of man came out of the sky and smote that idol into unrecognizable fragments. The king told you it was a gold shot from the English navy, or some other impossible cause, but you know what it was. It was the aroused public sentiment of the intelligent people of the United States that destroyed your idol, and it ought to have put an end to your idolatry. Then you looked around for the king, and there he was, as calm as could be, amid the fragments of his idol, as complaisant as Marius in the ruins of Carthage, blowing away on his cornet to beat the band, a wild, weird air called "The First Battle." And then you gathered around and went to work picking up the fragments of the great silver idol. That took you four years.

Four years went by and King Nebuchadnezzar thought he saw his chance again and he set up another graven image, and he made this one 60 cubits high, because he used all the old silver that was in the old one, and he added to it a lot of brass and mud and slime; and running down the great brazen cheeks of the idol were the slimy tears for Aguinaldo; and this idol also was taught to say "sixteen to one," as a sort of refrain; but he was taught to say many other things. It was all worked into a monotonous chant: "Anti-imperialism, anticanned beef, sixteen to one, one Filipino is as good as sixteen American soldiers—sixteen to one, antimilitarism, antiprosperty, anticommerce, antitariff." And then the edict went forth again that "at what time ye shall hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all other kinds of music, ye shall fall down and worship the graven image that I have set up; and whoso falleth not down shall be cast into the den of lions."

Well, now, there were some that were not at all afraid of the burning fiery furnace, who, when they heard the lions roar, got down on their marrow bones; but there was one who has been the Daniel of your party, Grover Cleveland. The roaring of the lions did not frighten him at all, and after you had been bowing down to this graven image quite a while you got up to see Daniel destroyed. You saw him cast into the den of lions and gathered around the mouth of the den, and behold! what do you see? There sat Daniel on a stone, just as sociable and comfortable as could be, passing his flask around to the lions and telling them fish stories. [Laughter.] The lions never touched him, and when he came out those lions just stood in two rows, between which he passed smiling. They have been afraid of him ever since; and not only the lions, but the tiger up in the State of New York has been afraid of Daniel. Now, wouldn't you think that would have put a stop to your idolatry? Well, it did for a time, and you sent Nebuchadnezzar out into the tall grass. [Laughter.]

Now, a strange thing happened. Has it ever occurred to any of you gentlemen on that side of the House what a remarkably profitable position leadership in the Democratic party is? I remember there was a local leader, Mr. Croker, up in the city of New York. I do not remember that he ever had any special business or profession. He led the Democratic party for a long time. After a while, when he got tired of it, he retired to old England and set up a fine establishment and a racing stable and began to lead the life of an English country—well, I do not care to cast any

reflections upon the rural gentry of England; but he is over there, living in splendor and running his racing stable.

So, when Nebuchadnezzar was put out to grass, the first thing he did was to make his arrangements to go over to the old country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. I will be glad to yield to a gentleman who contributed to the music of the ceremonies of 1896 and 1900.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman think that his going over there might improve the tone of English society?

Mr. BOUTELL. If the tone of English society was improved by his going over there, I should say, "God help English society." [Laughter.] Now, I have noticed this thing, that a Democratic leader militant froths and foams at the mouth whenever he refers to England or anything English, but when he becomes a Democratic leader recumbent or redundant, he finds something very attractive about old England.

Now, I have been wondering why this was. I have heard the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] affirm that all true Democrats are followers of Thomas Jefferson. He said, not very long ago, if the Democrats could nominate a man who believed all the theories of Thomas Jefferson they could make him President.

I have made some study of the theories of Thomas Jefferson myself, just to see what principles of Thomas Jefferson these Democratic leaders redundant sought to follow in hastening to old England. I ran across something which I thought explained the whole thing. In August, 1775, Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to his intimate friend, John Randolph, in reference to the impending conflict with Great Britain, in which he used this language, which has been lost sight of.

He regretted the possibility of war because he was a man of peace, but more especially because it would prevent a reunion with Great Britain, and he said:

I am sincerely one of those who would rather be in dependence upon Great Britain properly limited than on any other country on earth or that of any other country.

The gentleman from Mississippi will kindly correct me if I misquote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What date is that?

Mr. BOUTELL. August 25, 1775.

Again, I find that this distinguished founder of the Democratic party, as late as November 24, 1775, showed how thoroughly he loved union with Great Britain.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What was that date?

Mr. BOUTELL. November 24, 1775. I did not know but what these two distinguished leaders had gone over there to get up a union between Great Britain and the United States; but, perhaps, there was still another and a more recondite or personal one. In 1771 Thomas Jefferson, in writing to his agent, Mr. Thomas Adams, in London, closes his letter with these words, which I have very seldom seen alluded to and do not know whether they are regarded by Democrats as principles that all true followers of Jefferson ought to adopt:

One other favor. I wish you would search the Herald's office for the arms of my family.

[Laughter.]

What a picture! The founder of Democracy looking for his lost coat of arms! [Laughter.]

I have what I have been told were the family arms, but on what authority I know not. Possibly there may be none.

Well, now, if he came from a distinguished English family who were entitled to a coat of arms, it was certainly very justifiable to look it up, if only as a matter of curiosity. We know that many distinguished men in Virginia used to decorate their coaches with coats of arms when they were entitled to them.

Mr. Chairman, that would not have been astounding, of course, if he had been animated by a desire to see the genuine coat of arms in his family. No Democrat ever would have complained in those early days of his wearing it, but still it hardly seems Jeffersonian. "It is possible there may be none. If so, I want, with your assistance, to become a purchaser, having Stern's word for it that a coat of arms may be purchased as cheap as any other coat." [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Mississippi will kindly correct me if I misquote the distinguished author of the Declaration of Independence and the founder of the Democratic party. Now, it occurred to me that this new leader of the Democracy might have some such object as this in mind in going over to England and visiting the distinguished leader from New York—that of looking up his coat of arms. If he could not find any, perhaps he might arrange with the Herald's office to buy one.

Now he has come back, and we have the statement of the public press for it that he has got a new idea. I wonder if it is his

coat of arms that he bought over there? I can only surmise what it is, but there is no man perhaps better known in the wide world to-day than Mr. Bryan. The Herald's office knows his record, and they may have gotten him up some coat of arms which they would consider suited to his character. Possibly this: He beareth on a field argent a mule rampant, gules, with this motto, "Sexdecim cum uno."

Well, whatever he went over there for, he has come back. He has got an inspiration from Mr. Croker. He has got an idea, and he has brought it back, and all I wish to say to you gentlemen is, Take care, take care. You have charged us with idolatry; look out that you do not fall into any more idolatry, for you have still got William Jennings Bryan to reckon with, and I tell you that one of two things will happen to you, and it does not seem to me that it makes much difference which it is—Bryan is going to play again the successful part of Nebuchadnezzar and bring you into a new idolatry, or he is going to play the successful rôle of Samson. It makes little difference to your party whether you fall into a new idolatry or whether you have the pillars of your temple pulled down over your head. And it does not make any difference to us.

Now, when this idol worship was going on eight years ago the Chaldeans and soothsayers and astrologers went abroad through the land telling the people what was going to happen. We went into the campaign of 1896 perfectly openly. We said to the country that if we were elected we would repeal the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill.

Your soothsayers and astrologers told the people that if the Republican tariff bill was adopted and Republican financial measures were enacted terrible things would happen to this country. Some of the dire things which you predicted it is very easy to prove have not come true. You said, among other things, that with a Republican protective tariff our exports would fall off. Instead of that our exports began to increase immediately upon the passage of the present Dingley tariff act. I hold in my hand a statement from the Bureau of Statistics, showing the increase in the exports of this country during the period of some twenty years or more, which I will insert in the RECORD.

UNITED STATES LEADS IN EXPORTS

It is only within recent years that the United States has taken her place at the head of the list of the world's great exporters of domestic products. In 1875 the exports of domestic products by the world's great exporting nations were as follows:

United Kingdom.....	\$1,097,497,000
France.....	747,400,000
Germany.....	593,052,000
United States.....	497,263,737

In 1885 the domestic exports of these four countries stood as follows:

United Kingdom.....	\$1,037,124,000
Germany.....	680,551,000
United States.....	673,553,596
France.....	596,000,000

In 1895 the domestic exports of the four countries were as follows:

United Kingdom.....	\$1,100,452,000
United States.....	807,742,415
Germany.....	789,660,000
France.....	651,100,000

In 1903 the relative rank of the four countries in the exportation of domestic products was as follows:

United States.....	\$1,457,565,783
United Kingdom.....	1,415,617,552
Germany ^a	1,200,000,000
France ^b	812,000,000

^a Nine months' figures and estimate for closing quarter of the year.

^b Eleven months' figures and estimate for last month of the year.

RECORDS OF GROWTH.

The table which follows shows the exports of domestic products from the United States, United Kingdom, and Germany in each year from 1875 to 1903, the figures being in all cases for the calendar year:

Year.	United States.	United Kingdom.	Germany.
1875.....	\$497,263,737	\$1,087,497,000	\$593,052,000
1876.....	575,735,804	976,410,000	605,886,000
1877.....	607,596,495	967,913,000	656,982,000
1878.....	723,286,821	938,500,000	686,671,000
1879.....	754,656,755	932,090,000	690,352,000
1880.....	875,564,075	1,085,521,000	688,500,000
1881.....	814,162,951	1,138,873,000	707,978,000
1882.....	749,911,309	1,175,069,000	758,817,000
1883.....	777,523,718	1,106,982,000	778,257,000
1884.....	733,768,764	1,134,016,000	762,432,000
1885.....	673,593,596	1,037,124,000	680,551,000
1886.....	689,519,430	1,035,226,000	710,186,000
1887.....	703,319,692	1,079,944,000	745,896,000
1888.....	679,597,477	1,141,305,000	762,444,000
1889.....	814,154,894	1,211,442,000	753,222,000
1890.....	845,999,603	1,282,474,000	791,717,000
1891.....	957,333,551	1,203,169,000	755,771,000
1892.....	923,237,315	1,105,747,000	703,078,000
1893.....	854,729,454	1,062,162,000	735,886,000
1894.....	807,312,116	1,051,193,000	704,826,000
1895.....	807,742,415	1,100,452,000	789,660,000
1896.....	986,830,080	1,168,671,000	838,981,000

Year.	United States.	United Kingdom.	Germany.
1897.....	\$1,079,834,296	\$1,139,832,000	\$865,124,000
1898.....	1,233,553,140	1,135,642,000	894,063,000
1899.....	1,252,932,344	1,287,150,000	1,001,278,000
1900.....	1,453,010,112	1,417,086,000	1,097,509,000
1901.....	1,438,078,651	1,362,727,000	1,054,685,000
1902.....	1,333,288,491	1,379,282,000	1,113,313,000
1903.....	1,457,565,783	1,415,617,000	1,200,000,000

^a Estimate for closing quarter of year.

The exports during the calendar year just closed amounted to \$1,457,000,000, the record year in exports of the United States to foreign countries, nearly double the entire exports in the year 1895. But another thing that is very gratifying to us all, gentlemen, partisanship aside, gratifying to every American in this House, is that during the past few years our great Republic has changed its place from fourth in the list of exporting nations to first, and to-day we lead Great Britain, Germany, and France in our annual exports. [Applause.]

Again it was predicted that the volume of money in the country would decrease, but it has not; it is greater now than it ever was before. It was predicted that the gold in the Treasury would decrease, but it has not; we have more gold in the Treasury now than there ever was in the United States Treasury before, and we have more gold coin and bullion in the United States Treasury than was ever collected at any one spot before in the history of the world—nearly seven hundred millions of dollars. It was predicted that wages all over the country would go down, but on the contrary, from the inauguration of President McKinley up to this year just closed, the average rate of wages all over this country has gone up.

Not only the average money wage, but the actual wage as compared with the cost of subsistence.

Mr. BENNY. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. With pleasure.

Mr. BENNY. Will the gentleman tell us the rate of increase in the wages of the workingmen of the country and also the rate of increase in the cost of living to the workmen?

Mr. BOUTELL. I should be very glad, Mr. Chairman, to go into full details of that matter from figures that I have before me, but all I can say in the brief time allotted to me is that, from the statistics we have, it appears there has been a steady annual increase in the rate of wages of our workmen and mechanics, and that there has been a material decrease in the retail prices of most of the commodities of life which the workman buys with his wages.

Mr. BENNY. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I can put that question in better shape. Is it not a fact that the increase of wages to the workmen of the country has been less than 10 per cent, while the increase in the cost of living has been 30 per cent?

Mr. BOUTELL. It has not.

Mr. BENNY. Will the gentleman state what it has been?

Mr. BOUTELL. The average increase, taking all classes of workmen and mechanics throughout the United States, has been nearer 12 per cent. The figures that the gentleman alludes to in relation to the cost of living are simply the wholesale prices, whereas the actual cost to laboring men of the necessities of life was never so low as it is in the United States to-day.

Mr. Chairman, departing for one moment from the bounds of political discussion, let us all rejoice as Americans in the splendid record this country has made. I hold in my hand a copy of the daily consular reports containing a statement sent from one of our able consuls in Manheim, in which he goes into the rate of wages in that prosperous city of the German Empire. He shows that blacksmiths and other mechanics are getting less than one-half of the wages that men in the same employment are getting in this country, and that the cost of living to the workmen is constantly increasing in the German Empire. And so it has been with all of these predictions that were made by the Democrats in 1896; everything that was predicted by the Democrats has proven false.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. Nothing would give me greater pleasure.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman be kind enough to state what is the difference in the annual production of gold in the last four years from what it was in 1896 to 1900?

Mr. BOUTELL. The gentleman means the increase in the annual production of gold.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. The gentleman from Illinois spoke of the increase of the per capita rate from \$19 to \$29.

Mr. BOUTELL. Oh, no; I didn't say that at all, although it is true. I said that the prediction was in 1896 that the amount of gold in the Treasury would fall off if the Republican tariff bill

and the Republican financial measures were adopted. I said that now in the Treasury of the United States we have nearly seven hundred millions of gold against less than two hundred millions of gold in 1895.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Then, my friend does admit that the annual production of gold in the last four or five years has been enormously increased?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes; the annual production of gold, like our productions of the farm, of the workshop, of the loom, and of the mill, is unprecedented. I do not claim that that is all due to the Republican tariff or the financial legislation of the Republican party.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I thought the gentleman did.

Mr. BOUTELL. We have a great deal to thank God for.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I thought the spirit of the gentleman's argument was that the Republican party claimed the credit of it.

Mr. BOUTELL. Not at all; I said nothing upon which such a construction could be placed. I hasten to assure my friend from Alabama that the United States is under the guidance of the God of Nations, and that He sends His early and later rains upon the just and the unjust, as he always has upon the Democrats and the Republicans alike. [Laughter.]

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Arkansas, as I am going to speak of his State.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman said that all the predictions made by the Democratic party in 1896 had failed or were false.

Mr. BOUTELL. No; I said every serious prediction. You made some that were so trifling and immaterial that it mattered not whether they came true or not.

Mr. MACON. Was it not predicted by the Democratic party at that time that if we had a larger circulation of metallic money, if the per capita rate was larger, that we should have prosperous times?

Mr. BOUTELL. I do not know but what it was; but the main prediction was that if we had more silver money we would have more prosperous times.

Mr. MACON. Was it not more metallic money, but not silver?

Mr. BOUTELL. I did not hear much about anything metallic except silver. I will say to my friend, throughout that campaign.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Assuming this enormous increase in gold coin, suppose in 1897 we had enacted a provision for coining silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, in the opinion of the gentleman how much of the increase of gold coin would have found its way into circulation in the United States?

Mr. BOUTELL. Very little, and not one dollar into the Treasury of the United States. Speaking of that subject, I am very glad that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] remind me of it. I hold in my hand an editorial from the Chicago Chronicle, one of the ablest Democratic newspapers published in this country, under date of September 10, 1902, entitled "Gold in the Treasury." The sum and substance of this editorial is that the reason why there is more gold in the Treasury, not only Government gold but the people's gold, put there in exchange for gold certificates, is that the people of the country now have confidence in the financial system that we have adopted and are willing to let their gold stay there. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, these few remarks I have been making were merely on the side, as will be seen when I go further into my argument. I did not expect at this time to get into a general discussion, a general run of questions. I desired to call the attention of the House and of the country to this fact, that most of the prophecies, the serious prophecies, of the Democratic party relating to what would take place if the Republicans triumphed in 1896 and in 1900 have proven false, and all these predictions which can be gauged by official statistics have been so proven. But they also said, Mr. Chairman, in general terms, that if the Republicans triumphed and enacted a protective tariff law and financial legislation in keeping with the principles of the Republican party we would bring distress and disaster, blight and mildew upon the country. Mr. Chairman, it is to these predictions that I wish to address myself during the remainder of my remarks.

Seven years have elapsed since the Dingley tariff law was placed upon the statute books. They have been, in my opinion, seven good, fat years for this Republic. In my part of the country I could not find any blight or mildew, and I thought that if any existed I would like to see it, and it occurred to me that if that blight and mildew existed anywhere it would be in the State of Missouri and in the solid South, because it was in that State and in the solid South that the blight and mildew were most strongly predicted. I was at a loss to know how to make a trustworthy examination. I thought if I went through all the Southern States

myself and came back here and reported what I found there that it might be thought my views were tinged in some way by my political sentiments.

I did not wish to take the opinion of any mere Government statistics. I thought that it might be charged that those were incorrect. I did not wish to take any trade reports exclusively, except in connection with other reports, because I have heard it charged that these trade reports are sometimes tinged or colored. I did not wish to take the statement of any active politician. I did not wish to take the statement of newspapers in the heat of a campaign, and so I was at a loss to know where I could find an account of the spots of blight and mildew throughout this country. Then this idea occurred to me, that if there was anything honest in this world it was the newspapers.

I have had the word of my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on several occasions in this House that he would rather have a country without almost anything than without newspapers, the great educators of the people. So I said to myself, "I will go to the newspapers and find out what has been going on where this blight and mildew ought to be." I was afraid that papers issued during a campaign might be prejudiced. So it occurred to me that if I should hunt up the local papers—taking the metropolitan journals where necessary, and the little village and country papers, the weekly and biweekly newspapers that were published about the holiday time, that season of peace on earth and good will toward men—I would find the actual truth. So for the last three weeks I have been looking over the papers from the State of Missouri and from the solid South, and I must say to you, gentlemen, that I have been surprised at the condition of affairs disclosed by these local papers. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in his speech in the House on the 19th said:

Protection, Mr. Chairman, is a system of taxation whereby many are robbed in order that a few men may be hotheaded by legislation into artificial prosperity.

And the RECORD goes on to say that that statement was received with laughter and applause on the Democratic side. I may say that I was not at all surprised at the laughter, but I was surprised at the applause. He goes on further to say:

As a supplementary definition, protection is a system of taxation whereby capital and labor are deflected from naturally profitable pursuits and enterprises into the channels of naturally unprofitable pursuits and enterprises.

This again was met with laughter and applause on the Democratic side of the House, and again I say I do not wonder at the laughter. Before I go on to give the story of the condition of things throughout the South, let me impress upon your minds these words of the gentleman from Mississippi:

Protection is a system of taxation whereby capital and labor are deflected from natural profitable pursuits and enterprises into the channels of naturally unprofitable pursuits and enterprises.

Now, let us see if we can find any blight and mildew where we should expect to find it from the utterances of gentlemen on the other side. And I begin with the State of Missouri, for several reasons—partly because I have very tender recollections of the State of Missouri. I do not see here now my friend from Missouri, Mr. COWHERD, with whose district I will begin here. But during the closing year of the war, as a boy of 8, I spent one of the most picturesque years of my life in the district of that gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. You were a very old boy.

Mr. BOUTELL. I have given my age, and you see you are an older boy than I am.

The Kansas City Journal of January 1 says:

According to statements made by officials of the railroads running into Kansas City, every company has reason to rejoice over the business for the year just closed. One general agent said that the earnings of his road had increased 33 per cent over 1902.

That was bringing the cattle and the products of the farm.

The Star, in an editorial of January 1, says:

Bank clearings are not always a definite indication of business movements, but they may be taken as a reliable basis of comparison in noting progress in any one city. The clearings in Kansas City for the past year were one thousand and seventy-five millions, or an increase of eighty-six millions (9 per cent) over the record of 1902. Building records and real estate transfers show similar increase. Both the wholesale and retail merchants report gains.

I congratulate the State of Missouri and my colleague [Mr. COWHERD] upon this showing.

I next refer to the St. Joseph Gazette of January 1. I do not see here at present the gentleman who represents St. Joseph—and I think this is the first time that I have ever missed him from this House; he is one of the most regular attendants here. He played a very loud instrument in the ceremonies of 1896, but the principal thing that he claimed when he performed on his musical instrument was that never, never, under any Republican financial legislation, would there be enough basic money or any other kind of money in the country to do the business required.

I do not know what the gentleman's connection with the St. Joseph Gazette is at present.

[Mr. COCHRAN at this point entered the Hall.]

Mr. BOUTELL. Ah, I congratulate myself on seeing the gentleman before me. The St. Joseph Gazette of January 1 says:

The country upon which St. Joseph depends for its maintenance is prosperous to a most gratifying degree. Crops have been fairly abundant; prices for the products of the farm and range far in excess of the average for many years.

Now, mark this—what gall and wormwood it must be to the gentleman from St. Joseph—

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. BOUTELL. Of course. I always yield with great pleasure to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. With almost tearful gratitude, I rise to announce to the gentleman that among other acquisitions of the great syndicate which embraces so many of the daily papers of the country the St. Joseph Gazette is now owned by the followers of MARK HANNA and my friend from Illinois. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELL. I congratulate my friend from St. Joseph on having such prosperity in his district, that he was able to dispose of the St. Joseph Gazette at such a good price.

Mr. COCHRAN rose.

Mr. BOUTELL. The gentleman from Missouri when I am through will have an opportunity to deny the truth of these statements as to the prosperity in his district. And I may say now, Mr. Chairman, that as I read this story of the condition of the South I will ask any gentleman on the other side of this Chamber, if he cares to do so, to get up and deny the truth of this story that I read, and if he likes to go back to his constituents and tell them that he has made the denial.

Now, let me close what I was saying about St. Joseph.

Money we have in sufficient quantities to meet the reasonable requirements of every line of legitimate investment and for every department of trade.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in an editorial of January 1, says:

Fortune was kind to St. Louis in the year which has just closed.

And I congratulate St. Louis. We have in Chicago a sisterly regard for her. We have just been connecting the two cities by water, and I hope there will be a steadily increasing trade and commerce between those two cities on this great waterway.

Seldom in all its history has the city been more prosperous. Never before has the aggregate of its great business activities been so large.

Mark that.

December, 1903, broke the record for that month in bank clearings in St. Louis, with a total of \$234,063,008. This was \$24,945,152 in excess of that for the same month in 1902. In receipts of flour, corn, oats, rye, barley, corn meal, hay, lead, cattle, sheep, hogs, horses, and mules the city's transactions for 1903 were greater than for the preceding year, while there was a falling off in receipts for wheat, cotton, tobacco, wool, pork, hams, and other sorts of meats. In building operations the record for this city was broken in the year.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate St. Louis and the State of Missouri.

Now, we come across the country to the Old Dominion. First, I read from the Newport News Press, of January 1, in a news article, which says:

The merchants say that business this Christmas was better than it had been in four years. The police census, taken recently, showed that there were fewer vacant houses than there were a year ago; real-estate values are firm and rents are cheap. A better statement of affairs could hardly be asked for.

Then why, may I ask, does their Representative here ask for a change? Why not let well enough alone?

The clearing-house statement follows:

1903	\$7,312,235.66
1902	6,664,978.34

Now we come to Norfolk. The Despatch in an editorial of January 1 says:

The cities of tide-water Virginia have experienced a solid and increasing growth during the past ten years. Norfolk is in many ways better off to-day than a year ago. Churches, schools, charitable organizations, and business organizations have flourished and grown and improved within the year. Local bank deposits have shown a steady increase during the year, and local bank clearings also indicate an increase in the volume of business done in the city, and the record of the year past is the largest in the history of the city.

I congratulate the Old Dominion.

The Landmark in a news article of January 1 says:

The exports were \$9,375,282 in 1903, an increase of \$2,256,039 during the year, showing that the year has been a prosperous one in the shipping trade.

The Petersburg Index-Appeal, of January 1, in a news article, says:

In taking a view of the business progress of our city in 1903, as it relates to previous years, we are pleased to note that our people have been very conservative and the speculative rage has not impaired nor retarded the advance in regular business. In all regular pursuits the close is very satisfactory, advances having been made all along the line. The good crops of our contiguous counties, with unusually remunerative prices places, our agricultural neighbors in a very prosperous condition.

The Richmond Times-Despatch of January 1 says:

Merchants have had good trade, manufacturing industries have done well, and it is most gratifying that in spite of the stock panic and the shrinkage in the value of stocks and bonds the banks of Richmond have stood the storm

without a quiver and are to-day in every respect stronger and better than in any corresponding period of their history.

I congratulate the city of Richmond on this splendid showing. Florida: The Jacksonville Times-Union of January 1 says in a news article:

The record of shipping at the port of Jacksonville for the month of December was one of the best in the history of the port, and was a closing of one of the most remarkable years yet recorded in the annals of the city's export business. More than 2,000,000 feet of lumber were shipped from the port during December, 1903, in excess of the amount shipped for the corresponding month last year. Lumber is the basis upon which to compute the volume of the export trade, and this increase in spite of the fact that there has been a depression of values complained of by prominent lumbermen for the past several months.

The Metropolis of January 1 says:

The old year was extremely kind to Jacksonville. She has prospered unprecedentedly. There has not been a failure of a business house or individual of much financial standing during the past year. Millions of dollars more money are here in banks than ever before.

And let me say, Mr. Chairman, that you will notice through all these accounts that it has taxed the ingenuity of the editor to find adjectives large enough and broad enough to characterize the prosperous condition of the country.

The Pensacola News of January 1 says:

With the closing of the year 1903 the record of the local custom-house shows that the month of December has been one of the best on record. The total values, so far as can now be obtained, will aggregate the immense sum of \$3,148,056. The nearest approach to these figures was the same month last year, when the two-million mark was just passed.

The St. Petersburg Times of January 2 says in an editorial:

St. Petersburg has had a bright year, and an even brighter is before her. There is a no more prosperous spot in the Union.

I looked over the House for my good friend from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], in whose district this prosperous enterprising city is located. I congratulate him and his district. I come to Kentucky.

Lexington: The Leader on January 1 printed the views of the leading business men of the city on the achievements of 1903 and the outlook for 1904. In all branches of business the merchants claim that a prosperous year has passed and all take an optimistic view for the coming year.

Not some few Republicans in Lexington, but all the people in Lexington, unless it be her Representative up here, take an optimistic view of the future.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. I am very glad indeed to yield to the gentleman who played on the musical instruments during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900. I do not know whether my friend played the psalter or the base drum, but I am quite willing to yield to him for a few strains on either, although I may say I am coming to Tennessee further on.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I believed so. I know that all good men want to come down to Tennessee. [Laughter.] We have a great many from your country.

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes; they are going, and they are taking good money with them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now you complain—

Mr. BOUTELL. And not all Democrats—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If you will come down there we will elect you mayor of the city of Nashville in two years. You would be a shouting Democrat in Tennessee. [Laughter.] You speak of Kentucky. I live very near to Kentucky, and I know the condition of the people in that country as to tobacco growers.

Mr. BOUTELL. The gentleman does not seem to understand that I am reading from the local papers.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My mail is filled with letters complaining to me and to the Members of Congress about the terribly destructive internal-revenue regulations upon the tobacco-growing industry of that country, and the tobacco growers are now meeting all over Kentucky and Tennessee and are talking to-day about preparing a petition to Congress for a reduction of the tobacco tax, which is so destructive of their tobacco-growing industry. This tax began in 1862 and has been perpetuated to this hour. They want relief from it.

Mr. BOUTELL. I am glad that the gentleman from Tennessee has called attention to this desire on the part of the people of the State adjoining his. This paper shows him that those people of Kentucky, who, no doubt, will thank my good friend for his patriotism in rising in this House and making an iridescent appeal for the repeal of this obnoxious tax, do not complain of anything.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Sometimes people think that everything is true when they see it in a newspaper report, and it would be true if Thomas Jefferson edited it.

Mr. BOUTELL. Thomas Jefferson was not in the editing business. The Louisville Herald, in a news article, on January 1, says—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, that is a Republican paper.

Mr. BOUTELL (continuing to read):

High-water mark was reached by the bank clearings of 1903, with the handsome total of \$529,241,135.13, an increase of \$27,817,085 over the year 1902, the previous record period.

The gentleman from Tennessee indicated that this was a Republican paper. That is entirely irrelevant. As a lawyer he knows that it is a non sequitur. Do you wish to get up and dispute the figures of \$529,000,000 of bank clearings?

The Louisville Times in a five-page review of the year in the business of the city shows a large advance in all lines over previous years.

Now I come to the State of Georgia. First to the district represented by the gentleman who has charge of this bill on the minority side. The Atlanta Journal, in news article on January 1, gives city comptroller's report, showing receipts for 1903 of \$2,036,548.32, with a surplus of \$1,720.29 after provision has been made to meet all outstanding obligations. For 1902 the receipts were \$1,632,703.63. This statement shows the condition of all departments of the city government, and as such is therefore an index of the prosperity of the city.

The Atlanta Constitution, in a news article of January 1, says: Annual reports of all city officials show a bright chapter in the history of Atlanta, the year 1903 having been one of the most prosperous in its history.

In the same paper an article on the report of the Atlanta clearing house says:

The clearings of 1902 were increased by \$13,791,580.34. The year's record is a remarkable one, and is considered as a strong indication of the substantiality and growth of business in Atlanta.

The Augusta Chronicle, in an editorial of January 1, says:

Augusta enters the new year with every cause for encouragement. In the first place, her merchants, both wholesale and retail, wind up the old year with one of the best business records in their history. Their fall trade has been especially good, and while money has not been altogether plentiful, there has been enough to go around.

The high price of cotton has added thousands of dollars to the last year's income of tens of thousands of people throughout Augusta's territory. Throughout the country contiguous to Augusta the people are more than ordinarily prosperous and more than ordinarily hopeful for the future.

We know that Georgia people are always hopeful, and we are glad that now they are prosperous.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. BOUTELL. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. COCHRAN. That by most people is attributed to the boll weevil. Do you call that a Republican institution or not? [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELL. If I was going to reply truthfully to the gentleman who played the trombone in the ceremonies in 1896, I should say that was an entirely irrelevant remark. Whether the boll weevil was sent by Providence or was something originated by the Democratic party, I want to say to him that it was the Republican party in this House that without a division or an objecting voice or a roll call, in defiance of the principles of your party, generously appropriated everything that was asked for to extinguish the boll weevil, wherever it came from. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to ask a further question.

Mr. BOUTELL. Certainly.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do you think your constituents will be delighted when they find that you answer my question in that way?

Mr. BOUTELL. I think they will be very much delighted, but I will be glad to take you out there and introduce you to them and let them tell you.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the gentleman might have answered whether the boll weevil was a Republican concern or not. I want to know whether the Republican party is responsible for the boll weevil; whether the gentleman is responsible for it I do not know.

Mr. BOUTELL. I will pass on. We now come to Macon. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I ought to pause here in coming to the country of my good friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], for whom I have as high a respect as any man in the House, and great fondness, and say that it was disclosed in reading the report on this bill a few minutes ago that there was nothing the matter with the prosperity in Macon. The gentleman in charge of this bill called attention to the fact that down there in Macon they have prosperity so broad and deep that they are able to build a livery stable good enough for the United States post-office. I congratulate the gentleman on that condition of things down there.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, no.

Mr. BOUTELL. Does the gentleman deny they build good stables in Macon?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; they build such good ones that they are good enough for a Government post-office with a little addition.

Mr. BOUTELL. And the Republican party will give all the additions you want for the purpose.

Mr. BARTLETT. Much obliged.

Mr. BOUTELL. The Macon News of January 1 says:

Builders and architects declare that the past year was a splendid one in the building era of Macon. Buildings have been erected in 1903 worth

\$500,000, while many of these buildings were such as the Mercer University, costing some \$30,000, and St. Paul's Church, costing \$20,000.

I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia, not only on the prosperity of his district, but on the character of the buildings which this prosperity enabled him to build.

It is also noticeable that those owned by the working classes—

And I call the special attention of my friends on the other side of the Chamber to this—

It is also noticeable that those owned by the working classes and constructed with the savings of those workers form no small part of the number noted in the building inspector's report for the year.

I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia that these workingmen in his State are so prosperous. In the same paper, under an editorial, it says:

The new year finds Macon all right.

Of course it is—

Mr. BARTLETT. And always has been that way.

Mr. BOUTELL (reading)—

The city is progressing and our business concerns prospering and our industrial institutions are flourishing, and the year just closed has seen her limits extended, her population increased, her property has increased in value, and her trade has enlarged.

How could you get anything better than that?

In a news article of the Savannah News, it says:

Savannah established a new record during the year ending last night.

I am glad to see the gentleman from Savannah here taking in all this good news about his district.

The foreign exports from this port for 1903 were over \$9,000,000 greater than those for any previous year in the history and nearly 100 per cent greater than they were for the year 1890, which was one of the best years prior to the last four years.

Savannah's record last year shows that the confidence felt by its citizens in its future is not misplaced, and there will in all probability be a steady expansion in its business relations with the world outside of the United States.

In another news article of the same date the News says:

Business men of Savannah predict great things for the coming year.

Of course they are; they are entitled to it as long as the Republican party remains in power.

Past conditions have been good; advanced prices in cotton has helped all lines of business. Bankers, brokers, and business men generally are jubilant over future prospects. The banks have plenty of money to loan, despite the present fluctuations in the cotton market.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BOUTELL. With pleasure.

Mr. POU. I want to ask the gentleman if he claims sincerely that the Republican party is in any measure at all responsible for the present high price of cotton? Does the gentleman claim that his party is entitled to the credit of the price of cotton, which is now selling at 15 cents a pound?

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman from North Carolina misconstrues the trend of my remarks, and has confused what is said in these good Democratic journals with what I have said. I have made no claim at all of any such preposterous nature, and if the gentleman will kindly wait until I am through I should be very glad to yield to any questions that he may ask. I am making no claim as yet for what the Republican party has done or for what the Republican party has not done. I am reading from the local papers of thirteen States what the editors of those papers have to say in regard to the condition of things in their localities, and any claim that I have to make I will make when I have finished reading, and if the gentleman will kindly allow me to proceed, I will then yield to him.

I now come to North Carolina. The Rural News and Observer, in an editorial of January 1, says:

The year that closed last night has been a good one for North Carolina and the American Republic. Crops have been large and prices good. It has been a specially good year for farmers.

And this applies somewhat to what the gentleman says.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, might I ask the gentleman one more question? I admit that, so far as my section is concerned, we are enjoying unusual prosperity. That prosperity is brought about largely from two causes—the high price of cotton, which is the principal cause. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he claims that the Republican party is entitled in any degree to the credit of the present high price of cotton?

Mr. BOUTELL. The Republican party has nothing to do with the current price of cotton, specifically, any more than it has to do with the current price of any other article; but when the springs of prosperity are pure and at full pressure they will reach a high level all over the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In that immediate connection will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I have asked permission to continue the story of the condition of things in the Southern States, and after that is over I shall be very glad to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. BOUTELL (continuing the reading):

It has been a specially good year for farmers. There can be no widespread prosperity that does not reach the farm. When good times bless the rural homes there is improvement in every line of business and stability in the nation's financial condition, for it is the amount paid for farm exports that determines the balance of trade. High-priced cotton has not only blessed every avenue of trade in the South, but has blessed every section of the country. Cotton growing and cotton manufacturing mean much for North Carolina. The State depends chiefly upon the cotton farm and the cotton mill.

I am glad to call attention to the fact that the time has come now when, under the invigorating influence of Republican protection, the cotton manufacturing becomes profitable to the Southern States.

The Wilmington Morning Star, in a news article on January 1, says:

The steady increase in the commerce of Wilmington is extremely gratifying to the people of the city, and the growing importance of the chief seaport of North Carolina will alike be a source of gratification to the people of the entire State.

During the year 1903 the exports of Wilmington were more than \$20,000,000.

Now I come to South Carolina, and I quote from the Charleston News and Courier, in a news article of January 1, which says:

The banks of Columbia show by their reports that they have had a very successful year, and it follows that the people of the city have cause to be, in a large measure, satisfied with the last year's business. The total deposits in the five banks amount to \$3,503,907.50, a very large sum for a city of the population of Columbia. Compared with former years the deposits increased very much, and the bankers seem to be full of confidence of still greater proportionate increase during the present year.

The Greenville News of January 1, in a news article, says:

The year 1903 has been one of unprecedented growth and general improvement. Something like \$2,000,000 has been expended during the year in the erection of public and private buildings, manufacturing plants, and various other commercial enterprises. The most successful year in the history of Greenville has passed. Nineteen hundred and three has left the city greater, richer, and more prosperous than when it came.

We now come to the State of Tennessee. The Chattanooga Times, in a news article of January 1, says:

The balance, after deducting all expenses of the city, is much larger than a year ago. The reports show that fifty-five more permits for buildings and improvements were issued during 1903 than 1902, which was the banner year prior to 1903. These buildings and improvements were to cost \$640,000, as against \$556,000 in the previous year. The bank clearings of 1903 show an increase of \$10,000,000 over the preceding year, the total clearing for this year in Chattanooga being \$37,000,000. This is one of the best reports ever given out by the local clearing house and proves the condition of business in the city to be very healthy.

The Knoxville Journal and Tribune, in a news article, says:

According to the annual clearing-house reports, an enormous increase of 49 per cent is shown in 1903 over the preceding year. The clearings were fifty-eight millions as compared with forty millions, or an increase of \$17,000,000 in this city of Nashville. The building permits for the year were nearly double those of 1902.

Now we come to Memphis, and I ask the committee to pay especial attention to this. The Commercial Appeal, on January 1, in a news article, says:

For the year past the total clearings of Memphis were \$214,000,000. This figure is one that taxes the mind to comprehend.

I congratulate the district in which is situated the city of Memphis on its having a Representative on the floor of this House who can entirely comprehend these figures. The article goes on to say:

They show an excess over 1902 of about \$35,000,000, a monthly increase of nearly \$3,000,000.

The Scimitar of January 1, in an editorial, says:

Memphis starts the new year with as bright prospects as any city in the country. The records made in the various branches of industry in 1903 far surpass anything ever known here, and there is nothing on the horizon to indicate that the present prosperity will soon be eclipsed.

Evidently in the mind of the editor of the Scimitar the Democratic party is not on the horizon. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The Nashville Banner of January 2 says:

The increase of the Nashville bank clearings for 1903 over those of the previous year carry unmistakable proof of the business advancement of this city. The Nashville clearings show an increase of \$33,000,000, which is about 35 per cent, the total clearings for the year being \$124,000,000.

We now come to Alabama. The Birmingham News of January 2, under an article taken from the Manufacturers' Record, of Baltimore, says:

Leading railroad officials of the South and Southwest tell a story of progress and prosperity such as could never before have been presented from that section.

Listen to this—those who think that all the prosperity in the South comes from cotton:

Agriculturists, fruit growers, stock raisers, wood workers, timber operators, are coming into the South from all sections of the older and more settled States, and the development of every line of husbandry and industry is proceeding at a rate never before equaled in the South.

In a dispatch from Bessemer—does it not seem strange that if any town in the South is controlled by a Democratic population they would be willing to name a town Bessemer without repealing the duty on steel—in the Birmingham World and Herald of January 1, we find the following:

The year that goes out to-night has been especially prosperous for this city. The merchants will report an exceedingly healthy business, and are

looking for additional success during the coming year. The numerous new buildings which have been erected during the past twelve months bespeak the confidence placed in the prospects of the city of Bessemer. The banks are in a flourishing condition and enjoy the patronage of an immense number of citizens.

Here we have a dispatch from Selma, and I look about for the friendly and genial countenance of my friend Mr. BOWIE—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman in all that he says about all these things, excepting that he does not tell enough.

Mr. BOUTELL. I am telling all that I can within my hour, and my time has been extended already.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Everything the gentleman has said about Birmingham is a fact, but it is also true that within the past twelve months there were 60,000,000 tons of coal taken out by the South, and that Birmingham itself took out more than one-quarter, or 20,000,000 tons more than was taken out in the United States in 1880.

Mr. BOUTELL. So it is all over the South. It is the same grand story that comes to us. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like to remind the gentleman—

Mr. BOUTELL. I am coming to Mississippi presently.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I know; but I would like to remind the gentleman that that coal was taken out in the only year of free coal that we have had in a long time. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELL. If the gentleman really thinks that that makes any difference or that there is any politics in this matter, I can only recall—probably he will recall it, though it may seem a non sequitur—that the first tariff item placed in the bill of 1789, by a Virginian, was to tax coal, and in the Chamber of the House of Representatives he said, in pressing that item:

If we can put a restraint on the importation of coal, Virginia can furnish enough for all the United States.

That is where the first tax on coal came.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, if the gentleman will permit me a moment, he evidently misunderstood the application of my remark. It was designed simply to prove that neither the Republican party nor the Republican party's protective policy had anything to do with taking out that great amount of coal.

Mr. BOUTELL. And that the Democratic party and Democratic policy had still less to do with it, if that were possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, the removal of the tariff on that article did not hurt anybody.

Mr. BOUTELL. A Selma correspondent of the Montgomery Advertiser of January 2 sends an interesting dispatch, and in reading it I look around for my genial friend Mr. BOWIE:

The past year has been a memorable one in Selma in way of material advancement, as the following partial list of some of the visible improvements will show:

Louisville and Nashville Railroad bridge (completed)	\$300,000
Louisville and Nashville passenger station (completed)	25,000
First Baptist Church	42,000
City building	25,000
Elks' Home	21,000

Every Elk will appreciate that.

Public building (authorized)	75,000
M. W. Walker's stores and warehouses	15,000
C. W. Hooper & Co.'s modern store	30,000
W. R. Peacock's residence	7,000
Jud Brislin's residence	5,000
Twenty-five cottages (average cost \$2,000)	150,000

Total 495,000

"Twenty-five cottages!" That is what I like to hear about—these cottages going up in the South; that is the sort of prosperity that I like to hear of from every part of the country, and especially from the South.

Now we come to Arkansas. The Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, in an editorial of January 1, says—and I will say that anybody may stop me to say whether these papers that I am quoting from are Republican papers or not; this one is called the "Democrat."

Little Rock has made rapid strides during the past year, adding many substantial improvements to her material development.

The Gazette of January 1, in a news article, says:

The reports of the board of trade for 1903 show the business of the city to be in a very prosperous condition. The decrease in the cotton crop is overcome by the increase in value, as is shown by the bank clearings. The bank clearings for 1903 were \$52,388,174.78; for 1902, \$48,521,981.90, showing an increase of \$3,766,192.79, or 8 per cent.

The Gazette of January 2, in an interview with George R. Brown, secretary of the board of trade, says:

My opinion is that the past year has been the most prosperous in the history of Little Rock. By prosperous I mean that all classes of our people have done well; the laborer has had steady employment at a good wage; the merchants have had good trade; manufacturers have had more than they could do, and investors have reaped a rich harvest wherever their capital has been invested.

That is glorious news from Arkansas. We now come to Texas.

The Galveston News of January 1, 1904, publishes an article containing these statements:

Business over the wharves of Galveston during the past year was \$528,602,561, as against \$347,993,163 in 1902.

The growth of the port is satisfactory and all that could be desired.

Suffice it to say, the record of the past year is grand enough even in the estimation of the most sordid pessimist to inspire confidence in a glorious future.

During the year the port advanced from fourth to third place in its rank amongst exporting ports in the United States. Both the wholesale and retail trade in Galveston during the past year has been satisfactory.

The bank buildings were valued \$439,832,000, as against \$389,104,000.

The custom-house receipts were \$415,120, as against \$313,804 in 1902.

The foreign export values reached the enormous sum of \$143,168,564, as against \$92,756,044 in 1902.

A part of the increase is due to the high price of cotton and to the heavy movement of the staple during October, November, and December; but a portion of the increased business is due to the more general use of this port by the immense territory tributary to it.

The imports during the last year were \$1,377,328, as against \$1,312,319 in 1902.

In 1903 the Federal Government spent at the port of Galveston \$427,273.

The fund available for expenditure at the port for the year 1904 is \$1,059,510. During the past year 2,097 immigrants landed in Galveston, as against 1,481 in 1902.

I congratulate the Representative from that district [Mr. GREGG] on the splendid showing that Galveston has made among the great exporting and importing cities of the country.

The Austin Statesman of January 1, in an editorial, says:

In a business way Austin is largely indebted to the past year. Its business men can record a success that is a large improvement on former years. All departments of business have experienced this improvement. In the matter of erection of new buildings Austin in the last year has added greatly to the comfort and convenience of its people. Perhaps no city in the State has added within it and on its environs more architecturally handsome residences than Austin, and at the close of the year there is nothing to discourage, but much to animate to renewed activity in all departments, whether of public or private utility.

I certainly congratulate my good friend from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] on this magnificent showing in his district. And so it is all through the State of Texas.

The El Paso Herald, in an editorial of January 1, says:

Business in all lines has prospered during 1903. With a few comparatively unimportant exceptions there have been no business failures, and the general standing of business enterprises to-day is far better than it was a year ago.

The Fort Worth Record of January 1, in a news article, says:

From a financial standpoint 1903 was the best year that has ever passed over Fort Worth. The condition of the banks reflects the condition of the people. The clearings during the year were \$168,907,238.96, an increase of \$20,838,718.74 over the clearings of 1902.

The Galveston News of January 1, in a news article, says:

At the port of Galveston the year 1903 has been wonderful in many ways. The records of the previous years were not broken by a mere scratch, but so far surpassed that old values appear insignificant in comparison. Foreign exports were \$143,168,564. For 1902 they were \$92,756,044, an increase of \$50,412,520. Bank clearings for 1903 were \$439,832,000, as against \$389,104,000 for 1902, a gain of \$50,728,000.

The Galveston Tribune, in an editorial on January 1, says:

Texas, throughout its length and breadth, never enjoyed greater general prosperity than during 1903. Galveston has reflected 1903 in splendid shape. More records have been broken in the business done through the port and in the transactions of corporations, firms, and individuals doing business here than ever before in a single year.

The Post, of Houston, Tex., in a news article of January 1, says:

No better barometer of trade can be found in the city than the statistics of the clearing house. The clearings for the year were \$996,928,896, as against \$802,931,516 in 1902, an increase of \$193,997,380. The figures tell the story of Houston in the twelve months just ended, and indicate that the time has been a prosperous one.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wonder that our good friend, Representative Ball, wanted to get back to his district. We are sorry to lose him, but with such prosperity reigning there no one could blame him for wanting to be on the ground. But we extend a cordial grasp of welcome to his successor and congratulate him on the district that he comes from.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, let me ask my friend in this connection if that is not the State that has been suffering from the ravages of the boll weevil?

Mr. BOUTELL. It is; but I have no reflections to make on that. This story must be told in the words of the southern papers themselves, and if the gentleman will kindly let me finish this story I shall be obliged.

The San Antonio Express of January 1 says:

The year that has just been closed has been a remarkable one in the business history of San Antonio.

And I look about for my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] to dispute it or deny it if he cares to.

It was a year of magnificent prospects, which were reflected in the large real-estate transactions in the spring months. It was also a year of heavy crops, not only for the county, but for the trade territory of San Antonio, the healthy condition of the rural districts being reflected in a holiday trade that broke the record for many years.

Now we come to the good old creole State. First we have the Baton Rouge Advocate of January 1, and I look for my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana]:

Yesterday marked the close of a most prosperous year in the history of Baton Rouge. Good crops and splendid prices brought worlds of money to

our people, and all, black and white, have done exceedingly well. A new railroad opens up a new section of country to us and it will aid materially in our prosperity. Public finances—city and parish—are in fine condition, new enterprises are being installed, and the volume of trade and business continues to multiply and improve.

Is not that a grand statement from this community?

Here we have from New Orleans an editorial in a paper called the Item, on January 1, a paragraph of which says:

The year 1903 closes at New Orleans with a magnificent business showing, as evidenced by our bank clearings, which is an accurate index of the growth or decline of business. Clearances for 1903, \$927,710,850; for 1902, \$672,350,577.

The Picayune, in an editorial on January 1, says:

Probably never in the history of this city has there been a more prosperous period than that encompassed in the twelve months known as 1903. Of course the enhanced value of cotton has helped the clearings not a little, particularly during the last three months of the year, but that fact is not responsible for the principal portion of the gain. The South as a whole has been prosperous as it has never been before, and that fact has very naturally and properly reacted favorably upon the South's largest city and financial center. During the year New Orleans not only has held her own as a great cotton market, but she has wrested from New York the supremacy as the leading speculative cotton market.

I congratulate my friends [Mr. MEYER of Louisiana and Mr. DAVEY] on the triumphs of the financiers of New Orleans over those of Wall street. [Applause.]

The Times-Democrat, in an editorial of January 1, says:

From no part of the Union will the words "A happy New Year" come more appropriately to-day than in the South. Cotton, for instance, although a small crop, has returned the southern farmers several hundred million dollars more than the biggest crop ever raised. Cotton, however, is only one of the incidents of southern prosperity for the year. The lumber business was phenomenally large, and so, indeed, were the manufactures of all kinds. The South led the Union in its construction of new railroad trackage and in the increase in the amount of business its railroads handled.

And let me say of the Times-Democrat, for fear that it might be colored by any friendly feeling toward the present Administration, that some of the adjoining editorials would seem to indicate very plainly that it was still in the solid column of Democratic newspapers. It says:

Yesterday New Orleans closed its books on the best year the city has ever had in business. For the year 1902 over 1901 there was an improvement on the clearings of \$68,809,453, or 11.4 per cent, and we thought that very satisfactory and something to boast of, but 1903 shows an advance of \$255,350,273, or 38.1 per cent.

I call attention to this, and if any paper in the South can speak for all that country it is this journal.

Well might this paper give to the country a happy New Year on the part of the South.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me a minute?

Mr. BOUTELL. I asked that I might be permitted to conclude this story that is made up with scissors and a paste pot.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All right.

Mr. BOUTELL. We now come to the State of Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I yield the gentleman thirty minutes more time.

Mr. BOUTELL. I did not realize that this story was so good or so long or would be so interesting.

The Natchez Democrat, in an editorial of January 1, said:

A review of the past year in a business sense is hardly necessary at this time, as it is a fact well known that as a whole the year was filled with good trade. Cotton, which is our chief reliance, developed an unusual strength and began a march which almost brought it up to the highest price on record. New industries have been added to industrial circles, which is beneficial to all lines of the commercial world. There has been a substantial increase in railroad building. The building world of Natchez enjoyed a most healthful boom, and it will be continued through this year.

I hope that it will, and for very many years to come; and I am glad to know that the boom has struck Mississippi. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In looking over the little local papers to find out, if I could, the most trustworthy statements from the rural homes and the quiet retired spots, I ran upon the Weekly Clarion and Ledger, of Jackson, Miss., of January 7, 1904. I found that this little paper contained what purported to be the full text of the annual message of the governor of Mississippi to the legislature. I think Governor Longino had completed his four years' service, and delivered this as a valedictory address before Governor Vardaman had come in and delivered his salutatory. I felt certain that a man who had been governor of Mississippi for four years was better entitled than anybody else to speak for the whole State. I was glad, therefore, to find in his address so much information as to the conditions in Mississippi.

Now, I regret very much there are some expressions in this message which I would omit if possible, for fear of wounding the feelings of my friend from Mississippi, because they do not seem to be up to his plane of proper Democratic principle; but he will see that in order to keep the connection I had to keep in these expressions. Governor Longino, in completing his four years' service, spoke as follows to the legislature:

I desire to reiterate for the purpose of emphasizing now what I had the honor to say in my inaugural address to the legislature four years ago.

He then quotes from what he said four years ago, which I will now read. Picture to yourselves that he had just entered upon a four years' term of service as governor of the State of Mississippi:

It is perhaps meet to say here that now when the tidal wave of new industrial development seems to have struck the State, and capital is hunting investment here, a liberal and just legislative policy should be presented toward all kinds of corporations and corporate interests. It should be remembered that no country ever became truly prosperous or great where a becoming regard was not shown for the equal rights of both labor and capital by the laws, the courts, and the people. Experience has shown it to be wise State policy to extend liberal franchises and privileges to such corporate enterprises and offer mutual benefits to labor and the public generally as well as to the money they employ. I confidently hope, therefore, that no more sentimental and prejudicial opposition to railroads or other corporate enterprises will find favor with the legislature so that capital-hunting investment will have no just cause to pass Mississippi and go to other States offering wiser legitimate inducements.

[Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to reread this if I can in connection with the remark that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] made about protection deflecting capital that was profitably employed into channels where it would be unprofitably employed; and I ask him—and there will be time yet, either to-day or some other day—to explain whether this money that has gone into Mississippi has been deflected into unprofitable enterprises. That ends the governor's quotation from his message of four years ago, and now comes the message of three weeks ago, showing how well the legislature lived up to his advice. I think it is hardly necessary for me to ask my friend from Mississippi whether the legislature to which this advice was given was a Democratic or a Republican legislature.

This sentiment shared by both executive and legislature gave confidence to investment. Thus encouraged by liberal laws and tempted—

Mark this—

tempted by unequalled opportunities for profitable investment capital has poured into the State by millions and given to Mississippi an industrial, manufacturing, and commercial importance and thrift never before enjoyed by our people.

[Applause.]

I am glad of it. We are all glad of it. I was very much surprised. I could not have taken the words of the Clarion Ledger alone for it, and it was only the verbatim address of the governor that made me confident that this good news was true that "capital has poured into the State by millions and given to Mississippi a prosperity that she has never enjoyed before." I am glad of it, and the country is glad of it.

The governor goes on and quotes from the annual report of the secretary of state, in which he says:

That during the years from 1900 to 1903 747 corporate charters were granted, representing a capital of \$73,000,000, as against an issue of 365 charters in the four years from 1896 to 1899, aggregating a capital of \$25,000,000, although during the earlier four-year period, from 1896 to 1899, only a \$3 fee was charged for each charter.

Whereas during this latter period (that is, the four years of great prosperity) these charters were charged up according to the capital stock. Now, you see, you have this careful arrangement by the secretary of state of Mississippi into an eight-year period, from 1896 to 1899 and from 1900 to 1903, and during all this period money has been coming in there by the millions, and the prosperity and the manufacturing enterprises and granting of charters have continually increased. Then, commenting on this, the secretary of state says:

The increase in the amount of business in the State during the eight-year period—

Now, mark this, not something sporadic, not something due to the boll weevil, not something due to adventitious circumstances, but "the increase in the amount of business in the State during that eight-year period"—the period of Republican administration of this country—

has been healthy, steady, and rapid each year, showing marked progress over its predecessor. The assessed value of the property of the State in 1899 was \$182,275,900, while in 1903 the value of the State's property aggregated \$252,000,000.

[Applause.]

And then the governor says:

I feel safe in venturing the assertion that Mississippi stands among the foremost, if not in the lead, in the rank of railroad building—

And the governor continued—

I therefore commend—

Remember, this was just three weeks ago—

to this legislature a continuance of the liberal policies which characterized the course of your predecessors and feel that nothing will be done by you to check the State's great progress.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Stand pat! [Applause.]

Mr. BOUTELL. That seems to be what might be called a condensed version of the address of the governor of Mississippi.

Well, now, such in brief—and I wish for your sakes, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that it had been briefer—is the story of prosperity in the "solid South" and the State of Mississippi during the year which has just closed. You will notice that they have all

predicted equal if not greater prosperity in the future, and as confirming that prediction I will read just a few words from one of the trade reports, bringing the figures down to the week ending January 1, 1903, which says:

Confidence in a prosperous spring trade finds support in an enlarging volume of business in southern and southwestern markets, an awakening of interest at some of the northwestern centers, and growth even at central, western, and eastern markets, where, however, weather conditions are a drawback to the fullest activity.

The good prospects coming into realization during the third week in January are altogether in the South and Southwestern States. Now, from the bank clearings for the third week ending January 21, I find this splendid showing, that in nineteen southern cities there has been an increase in bank clearings from one-tenth of 1 per cent in the western city of Kansas City up to 105 per cent in Jacksonville, Fla., and 133 per cent in the city of Memphis, Tenn.:

BANK CLEARINGS FOR THE WEEK.

The following table, compiled by Bradstreet, shows the bank clearings at the principal cities for the week ended January 21, with the percentage of increase and decrease as compared with the corresponding week last year:

City.	Amount.	Percentage of—	
		Increase.	Decrease.
St. Louis.....	\$56,167,628	14.5
Kansas City.....	22,194,008	.1
New Orleans.....	25,146,323	34.8
Richmond.....	5,210,286	15.4
Savannah.....	4,147,007	1.6
Memphis.....	6,744,846	133.7
Atlanta.....	3,431,828	2.7
Nashville.....	2,968,291	8.8
Norfolk.....	1,963,273	22.3
Augusta, Ga.....	1,791,287	10.8
Birmingham.....	1,262,636	10
Knoxville.....	1,438,061	25
Macon.....	867,000	9.9
Lexington.....	654,935	4.8
Chattanooga.....	786,441	18
Jacksonville, Fla.....	779,234	105.5
Houston.....	18,223,113	16.9
Galveston.....	9,770,000
Charleston.....	1,287,419

Now, Mr. Chairman, such is the story as told by the local newspapers of the industrial and financial conditions through the State of Missouri and the whole South.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BOUTELL. I would like not to be interrupted for a moment until I complete this.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Just this—

Mr. BOUTELL. If the gentleman from Alabama will kindly suspend.

Such, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is the bright story told by the local newspapers throughout the State of Missouri and the Southern States. Is it not good news that this story brings? Is it not splendid news? Is it not glorious news? I ask the gentlemen from the districts where these papers are published, Is it not true news?

Isn't it something that we are all glad of aside from any political reason which one or another may give for this situation? We are all glad of it, Mr. Chairman, as American citizens. There never was, perhaps, a sadder sight in the history of the world than the condition of the Southern States at the close of the awful war of 1861 to 1865. I sometimes think, my friends on this side of the Chamber—you who bore arms for the North in that conflict, I am sure, will agree with me—that we have failed to appreciate what an awful blow that war was to the South. The bloodiest battlefields in the history were fought in her territory. The people had lost all their property. The wives and mothers and sisters who had buried their dead did not even have the means with which to erect lasting monuments to their memory. All over the South forty years ago, in almost every county, there were burying grounds of southern soldiers with no soldier's monument. Those who mourned were unable to place any memorial over their dead except the fading tribute of flowers. They were unable to write any inscription over their dead except with their tears.

But now it has all changed and we all rejoice in the new and better order of things. I am glad of all that this story tells for the sake of the wives and mothers and the sisters of these soldiers who lost their lives in that war.

Stoop, angels, hither from the clouds;
There is no holier spot of ground
Than where defeated valor lies
By mourning beauty crowned.

[Applause.]

We rejoice, too, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of those who went

back from the war, the young men who went back from Appomattox, taking their horses with them by command of our magnanimous leader, who found their homes in ruins and their fields devastated, and who for forty years have paid without complaint these taxes which have been most largely spent at the North. Now they are coming to their own again, and we congratulate them.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad of this bright story from the South for one personal reason, let me say to my southern friends. The first murmuring of that awful struggle came to me as a child of 5 in a little quiet New England town. I had a father and six near of kin in the northern army, and of course I remember some of the bitterness that raged between the two sections. In the chances of war I landed as a youngster in western Missouri, and finally in the State of Lincoln and Grant. Of course, for many years following, the bitterness between the two sections was kept up. All that is over and gone. I see before me, among my best friends, the sons of those who lie in Confederate graves, and during the last few years I have thanked God daily in my heart that I have lived to see the day when the last trace of bitterness between the two sections of this country has vanished forever. [Great applause.]

I am proud that I was granted the privilege of serving in this House with some gentlemen who had been officers in the southern army, and to see them, when the call to arms came in our war with Spain, promptly offering their services.

It was a glorious sight when such soldiers as Lee, of the Old Dominion, and Wheeler, of Alabama, put on the uniform of the United States Army and marched under the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.] But that is not all. These men are growing old. The gray uniforms hang in their houses to-day, but when these great heroes of two wars come to give up all there is of mortality they will be laid in the earth clad in the uniform of the United States Army, with their casket wrapped in the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I hope you will pardon this digression, but it does seem to me that this is an occasion where we can all rejoice in this splendid prosperity, this unequaled prosperity, that exists all through the southern part of our country.

And now I do not claim that this is all due to the Republican protective tariff; not at all. Mr. Chairman, no one who even tried to think as a statesman would ever make any such claim as that. The only claim I make, the only claim the most ardent Republican could make, is, and it can not be denied, that the principle of protection is an American principle; that the principle of protection has always been recognized on our statute books; that the Dingley revenue act is the wisest and most beneficent tariff act for all sections of the country that has ever been placed on the statute book; and this story and that which I have read tend strongly to prove this claim.

This story shows that the blight and mildew which were predicted as the certain results of Republican victory seven years ago can not be found in any part of the country. And so, as the campaign is coming on, the platform of the Republican party needs nothing but its record during the last eight years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad if the gentleman will not interrupt me at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BOUTELL. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no more doubt about our leader than there is about our platform. [Applause on the Republican side.] I know that some gentlemen on the other side of the House have censured our President for being impetuous; but I want to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the people of the United States would rather have a President who is impetuous and frank than a President who would be suave and subterranean. The people know what Theodore Roosevelt stands for, and he needs no defense in this House or before the people. I want to tell you that we love him and you fear him for the enemies he has made. [Applause on the Republican side.] Has he forfeited any Democratic esteem because in season and out of season he has been zealous in enforcing the laws against illegal combinations? Censure is the tax that strong men pay for doing right, and Roosevelt has always been a heavy taxpayer of this kind.

Has there been anything in his attitude toward any of the public questions of the day in which he has not shown himself equally strong, frank, and manly in dealing with them? Let me say to those on this side of the Chamber who read with misgiving that this man or that man or the other man in our party is looking for another Presidential candidate that such statements are no new thing in our history. Why, away back, even in the time of George Washington and the early Presidents, every President who was ever elected to a second term had to meet at the close of his first term the intrigues of personal enemies and even the schemes of rivals. And so it has been all the way down through our history.

I want to call attention briefly to the experience of Abraham Lincoln. In 1863, when he was bearing the great burdens that were put upon his shoulders, he had his Horace Greeley, who wanted to see Rosecrans nominated in 1864. Greeley proposed to force Abraham Lincoln to retire, make Hamlin President, and Rosecrans the candidate in 1864. A committee was sent by Greeley to Missouri to ask Rosecrans if he would come into the scheme. He gave them the reply of a brave and devoted soldier, when he said:

My place is here. My country gave me my education and is entitled to my military service.

Then there was in Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet Mr. Chase, the Secretary of the Treasury, who used his position in the Treasury to further his own candidacy for the Presidency. President Lincoln treated him with as much calmness and courtesy and affability as though he were loyally supporting him, but what happened? The legislature of Ohio instructed all its people for Abraham Lincoln, and when the electoral college met Mr. Lincoln got every vote in the college but 21. Afterwards, with unparalleled magnanimity, he made Mr. Chase Chief Justice of United States Supreme Court.

So it was in the days of Grant in 1872. There were those who were going to replace him with another candidate. The same occurred in the case of Grover Cleveland, and in the case of Mr. Harrison, and four years ago there were rival candidates springing up against William McKinley. So, I want to say to you, my friends on the other side, do not take a bit of comfort in what you see in the newspapers about troubles in the Republican ranks. There is no question as to who will be the nominee of the Republican party. With the record of the Republican party behind it for the last seven years, and no question about our leadership, there can be no question as to the result. Our record will be our platform and Theodore Roosevelt will be our candidate, and he will be reelected by the same kind of majorities that were given to Lincoln, to Grant, and to McKinley.

I tell you, my friends on the other side of the Chamber, if there were not so many among you down in your country who are merely what I call "geographical Democrats" or "social Democrats," in other words, if you voted your honest convictions on financial and economic questions next November, Theodore Roosevelt would be reelected by as large an electoral vote as was given to President Monroe in 1820. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, if I have any further time I yield it to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no more time.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then I will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] to yield the gentleman some of his time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I can not do that. I yield thirty minutes now to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that nobody in this Chamber has listened with more pleasure to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] than I. From grave to gay, from humorous to pathetic, from the actual to the fictitious, he has furnished us pleasure for over an hour. He has proven himself master of the entire gamut of the musical instrument which he accused me of playing, the dulcimer. [Laughter.]

Now, I am not going to allow the gentleman from Illinois to assume either all of the patriotism or all of the pride and pleasure and happiness in the spectacle of American prosperity that can be felt by American citizens. I, too, thank God for the things which we have, though I am not quite ready to "stand pat" upon them and say that they are "well enough." I have never known things to be "well enough" in this poor, miserable world of ours.

But I am ready to go back in history with the gentleman from Illinois. I am ready, too, to thank God that we are a united citizenry. I am ready to thank God that there are children in this world to-day whose mothers were daughters of Confederate soldiers and whose fathers were sons of Union soldiers. I am, above all, Mr. Chairman, ready to thank God that there does not exist to-day along the Potomac, along the Ohio, and along the southern boundary of Missouri and the southwestern boundary of Texas a line of custom-houses "protecting" us from one another. [Applause.]

I am ready to thank God that Massachusetts can consume the cotton of Mississippi and the sugar of Louisiana, and that Louisiana can consume the iron of Pennsylvania. And I thank God for it, because I know in my heart that if we were separate and independent governments and each was "protecting" itself from the "pauper labor" and "inundation of products" of the other, we would be vastly less happy and less prosperous than we are to-day. [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, not long ago I went down to Newport News with my good and valued friend, Mr. LACEY, of Iowa; and he told me during the trip that somebody had said to him that there was now no difference between a Yankee and a Southerner, except that one "reckoned" and the other "guessed." Not many days ago in Boston, addressing the "Free Trade League," I announced to them the glad tidings that even that difference had disappeared; that since we had fallen heir to the present incumbent of the White House nobody "reckoned" because there was no basis to "reckon" on [laughter]; that we were all Yankees now, because we were all "guessing" [renewed laughter]; and that nobody could guess even twenty-four hours in advance. [Laughter.]

Why, sir, the gentleman says we have objected to this candidate because he is impetuous. I dare say that perhaps the word he heard was somewhat different from that. Was not the word "cataclysmic" or "earthquakey," or "volcanic," or some other word! Are you sure [addressing Mr. BOUTELL] that it was simply "impetuous?" [Laughter and applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes, because I read it from the gentleman's speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I think not; they must have misquoted me.

Now, another thing: We are not, as the gentleman apprehends, taking any comfort out of the fact that other candidates are arising to oppose the renomination of the present incumbent of the White House. On the contrary, we are shaking in our boots for fear that some of them may succeed. [Laughter.] The comfort we are taking is out of the fact that you have gone so far that you can not go back, and you are obliged to nominate him. [Applause on Democratic side.] You have got to "stand pat" on him, together with all the other things.

About a year ago a number of your State conventions swore that the horse was "eighteen feet" high, and as you have announced a general all-round "stand pat" policy you have got to keep on swearing that that horse is "eighteen feet high."

Why, my friends, I do love to listen to the gentleman from Illinois. There is nothing that pleases me so much as a public speech of his, except perhaps a private conversation with him. But I love to listen to his public speeches because he is so sweet mannered in his cocksureness of everything, and so remarkably amusing in his hatred and contempt of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. BOUTELL. On the contrary, I have a very high regard for most of Thomas Jefferson's opinions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; it is that sort of "regard" I heard that an Irishman had for a candidate; when he was asked to "go for him," he said "I went for him last night; I tried to smash his nose all over his face." [Laughter.] I never hear the gentleman expressing any "regard" for Thomas Jefferson; I always hear him trying to "smash his nose all over his face."

The gentleman this morning quotes something about Mr. Jefferson wanting to know if he had a coat of arms. In his day nearly everybody had a coat of arms. Unfortunately for poor old Thomas Jefferson he was derived, as I am, from common Welsh stock and he could not find any coat of arms. But George Washington found one and sported it everywhere; and I have never heard anybody blame him for it. [Laughter.]

The next step was that the gentleman suggested a coat of arms for Mr. Bryan. Will he permit me to suggest a coat of arms for his candidate—"the man that everybody is for and nobody wants." [Laughter.] I would suggest a caricature that I saw in the Post not long ago—the face of a certain Republican up-builer and organizer upon a dog's body, looking down in a very dignified and good-humored, though somewhat contemptuous, manner, and a little child, with the beatific countenance upon him that we know so well at the other end of the Avenue, looking at him and saying, "Can't you talk?" [Laughter.]

Or, if you are not willing to "stand pat" on that coat of arms, I will suggest another of a more serious character, another caricature that I saw in another paper—a man astride of a cannon marked "Presidential Cannon," with his back to the muzzle and his face to the breech, with a whole lot of groundlings whose ears he tickles, out behind the breech, throwing up their caps and huzzaing, and the man who is playing with the Presidential Cannon touching it off every now and then to see if it would hit anything, but in absolute ignorance of what was in front of it and in absolute recklessness of what was in front of it, too. So much for coats of arms, my friends.

The gentleman says I played upon the dulcimer. I wish I were a musician and could play upon some instrument to the glory and the honor and the praise of Democracy and of its father, Thomas Jefferson. I would not mind even it were a dulcimer; but the gentleman has played upon the dulcimer this morning, and in playing upon it he has spent quite a long while eloquently and

genially and intellectually, too, singing as he played the praises of God and the American farmer, but leaving people to infer that in somehow or other the Republican party was responsible for God and the American farmer. [Laughter.]

Why, do you know, I dislike very much to sink to the ordinary anecdotal phraseology of Abraham Lincoln upon an occasion of this magnitude and dignity. I love dignity, you know; but an old anecdote of Abraham Lincoln occurs to me. The gentleman gets proper hoc and post hoc and everything else mixed up. He gets certain things occurring accidentally together with an accidental Republican administration, and then he couples these things together and would have you believe—although he is too honest to come out and say so, still the object of his speech is to have the reader of it draw the inference—that the Republican party is somehow responsible and in some way to be credited for it all. Abraham Lincoln once said that there was a woodpecker away up in the top of a tree, pecking and pecking and pecking at the tree, and after a while a windstorm came along and blew down the tree and the woodpecker; and the woodpecker believed to its dying day that it pecked the tree down. [Laughter.]

The gentleman tells me that the South is prosperous. Of course the South is prosperous.

Mr. BOUTELL. But we never heard it from the other side of the House during the last three months.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why, you have heard it from me, I am sure. Of course the South is prosperous. Do you know what I am going to do? I am going to get as many copies of the gentleman's speech as the gentleman from Illinois in his generosity will allow me to have, and I am going to distribute them as an immigration pamphlet for the South. Does he think that he can take any more pride or pleasure in the prosperity of Dixie Land than I can? I imagine he can not. I want to use that speech as an immigration inducer. We want more white people down South. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They will help us to solve our great problem. Of course the South is prosperous, and the South would have been doubly as prosperous as it is to-day under Democratic local administrations all over the South but for the dread ten years' history of Republican misrule there. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And the South would be trebly as prosperous as it is to-day but for the indefinite, vague dread of some sort of an outside superimposition of Africanization through the Republican party at some day in the future. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, the South was rich enough this year to finance her own cotton crop; and when the men that knew the cotton crop was short went up to New York and wanted to borrow money, they said: "We will stop this little thing. We will not lend them a cent." Hitherto in the history of the country whenever they said that, that did stop it; but this year they went right down to New Orleans and Charleston and the other southern cities and borrowed every bit of it.

And I will tell you another thing. I will be still prouder than I am now of the fact that this is a reunited country and that South and North stand together, whenever you cease to let ooze out of you unconsciously the conviction down in your own hearts that we are not the children, but the stepchildren, of the Republic. There are two unwritten laws in America to-day.

Gentlemen talk to me about being reunited and all under one Government and proud of it, and we are proud of it and glad of it; but there are two unwritten laws in this country to-day equally unjust. We boast that we have absolute religious freedom and equality, and yet no Roman Catholic, if he were the wisest man in the land, could possibly be nominated for the Presidency; so we boast that we have absolute sectional peace and equality, and you boast of your magnanimity, and yet it is a known fact that no Southerner, if he were the wisest and most patriotic man in the land, and if he drew the breath of life for the first time as late as 1866 or 1867, after the unpleasantness was over, could be nominated for the Presidency of the United States, or if nominated could be elected.

The gentleman asks me a question about the millions capital that have floated into the State of Mississippi. He asks me if it had been deflected from otherwise profitable pursuits, as I said was the case with capital drawn by legislation into industries created by a tariff. I will answer the gentleman by saying this: not one dollar of the millions was drawn to the State of Mississippi for cultivating one single protected article upon the Dingley schedules. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That capital was not drawn by protectionism. It was therefore not housed out of some other pursuit and not deflected from use in otherwise profitable pursuits. Why, the State of Mississippi is the most purely agricultural State in this Union.

With an area of about the State of Iowa, perhaps not so much, 46,000 square miles, she has a population of a million and a half of people, and yet has only one town in her entire borders of 20,000 population; only two that pretend to have 12,000 to 15,000,

and all the balance of the people live as their Teutonic ancestors did in Europe, and as their English ancestors did in Great Britain, out in the country, living the life of independent countrymen, in God's free air, learning to do all things, not a slave to the division of labor, where a man drives a tack, tack, tack, with a piece of machinery all day long, until he forgets how to think.

What does the protective tariff have to do with all this prosperity that the gentleman was singing about this morning? Has the protective tariff raised the price of cotton to 15 cents a pound, or, as it was yesterday, 16 cents a pound in New York? It has only taxed the cotton raiser on nearly everything he buys—implements, gins, fence wire, etc. Does a gentleman of common sense upon that side dare to stand upon this floor to-day or to-morrow and say that a protective tariff has given value to the oats and to the corn and to the cattle and mules that have been raised in the State of Mississippi? America exports all of these. Is there a gentleman upon that side who will say, that with regard to the heavy cotton goods that are manufactured in the State of Mississippi and are sold in competition with Germany and England in China and Manchuria and other world markets where the greater part of those Southern goods are sold, that they owe a particle of the prosperity of their makers to your protective tariff?

The South does not owe but one thing to you, and it does not owe that to you as the Republican party. It owes it, however, to I do not know how many millions of men—about two millions on one side and six hundred thousand on the other—who met one another bravely in battle and settled a long-disputed question that could not be settled any other way. It owes, perhaps, something to the result of that conflict; and what it owes to this result is simply this: That the magnificent broad area of free trade, carrying welfare with it from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf to the Canadian border, is not divided in the middle by customs-houses. [Applause on Democratic side.] I am sure that is no latter-day Republican doctrine, whatever it may have been earlier.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not had any time to make an elaborate reply to my friend from Illinois, who seems to have grown tired of this "standing pat," and wants now to go backward. This morning his discourse might have been divided into two heads—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman sufficient time to finish his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time.

Mr. PAYNE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not know; ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that he have ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia yields to the gentleman.

Mr. BOUTELL. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that he will have all the time he wants. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman's remarks might have been divided into two parts, unlike the ancient Gaul which was divided into two parts, but into two parts like the Republican party to-day. One part was his desire to quit "standing pat" and taking a position in Congress on past issues, or at any rate not live issues, to see if he could not put Democracy on the defensive, and the other was the cheap, often sung and ancient song that "steers are worth six cents in Missouri." While the gentleman speaks of a past and honored leader of the Democracy, able, patriotic, and honest, who can not be belittled, because he does not deserve belittlement, as being a Nebuchadnezzar, I call attention to the fact that the Republican party to-day is not even a Nebuchadnezzar. It can not even "eat grass." It can not do anything except "stand pat" [laughter], standing pat with its head up and its eyes shut, and it will starve to death and starve the country, or else get knocked in the head and thrown aside if it does not give up its attitude pretty soon. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Now, I did not say that every man who believes that the Dingley tariff bill was a good bill was a fetish worshiper. I said every man who said it was the duty of a great party in the interest of the country to "stand pat" upon every schedule of it was a schedule fetish worshiper, and what else are you if you are not that? You must have one of two reasons for "standing pat" upon every single solitary schedule of a bill after parts of it have proven too high, even from your own standpoint. It must be either because of the worship of the schedule or it must be because you are afraid to touch it.

Now I know you all too well to believe that the latter reason can possibly be the reason actuating you in "standing pat." I do not believe you are at all afraid. Some people have insinuated that you thought may be if you opened the matter up all sorts of

differences in your ranks might appear; objections might come from Iowa, out amongst the "new idea" people; some from Minnesota, and that Michigan might have a word to say, and Boston might have something to say, especially upon the coal question and Canadian reciprocity, but I do not believe you are really afraid of one another. Are you?

Somebody has insinuated that maybe if you didn't "stand pat" that New England might want to put hides on the free list and the hide men might want to reduce duty on shoes 50 or 75 per cent; but I do not think so meanly of you as to believe you are afraid of your hide men, or your boot men, or your shoe men. Of course not. You are surely braver than that. It is simply because way back in your hearts schedule worship has become your religion, and, by the way, you have about ceased to have any other religion. You just worship the tariff schedules and the old song, "Bees are worth 6 cents a pound in Missouri." The gentleman says, however, we have worshiped fetiches, and I think he is a little bit unfair in a part of that argument.

In 1896 the Democratic party went before this country, not crying, as he says, for silver and nothing else, but crying for bimetallicism and for the equal coinage of both metals at a fixed ratio—for the law of Andrew Jackson's Administration. The Democratic party at that time adopted as its slogan that without a substantial increase in the volume of metallic, self-dependent, self-sufficing, self-redeeming, price-fixing, *real money*, there could not be a scale of rising prices, that there would continue to be a scale of falling prices.

But it is true that the Democratic party at that time thought that the only possible manner in which it could get an increase in the volume of metallic money was through the free coinage of silver. With the lights then before it, it could not have hoped for it from any other source, unless its members and leaders had been seers or prophets. It is true that since that time God, who is so much kinder to His children than their elected legislators are, has mapped out a way by means of which what they sought in 1896 has been accomplished. They have gotten through the act of God and by human intelligence and invention through the instrumentality of gold that which they sought from human legislators through the instrumentality of silver. What has occurred?

Why, I remember standing upon this floor in 1893 and some gentleman said, "Does the gentleman from Mississippi pretend that the world could absorb \$210,000,000 a year of silver production?" I replied in my poor, weak, and modest way, that I thought it could at a slight and gradual increase of prices. At that time the production of gold was a hundred and nine million. I have not seen the figures lately, but from the last I saw the production of gold was \$340,000,000 per year, more than all the silver and all the gold of all the world put together at the time when we were making that fight in 1893 upon this floor, and we do not owe it to the Republican party; we owe it partly to accident under the providence of God, in the way of discovery of new gold mines; we owe still more to the inventions and new methods by which incorrigible ores are treated. The world has easily absorbed the increase with only a moderate rise in the scale of average prices.

Mr. BOUTELL. Will the gentleman kindly yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELL. Would the gentleman now favor a return to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and would you make that a part of your national contention?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will answer that right now, sir. You know frankness is my fault.

Mr. BOUTELL. Otherwise I should never have asked that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no more doubt now, speaking for myself, than I had in 1893 or in 1896, of the correctness of the underlying economical principles which justified our appeal for bimetallicism. I have no doubt at all of this proposition that God has fixed the price of metallic money just by the same law that He has fixed the price of wheat and cotton, of the dancing ballet girl, or an opera singer, by the law of supply and demand, by correlation of a number of people who make an effective demand for a product and the supply of the product itself.

I have no more doubt than I have had in all my life that under the will of God the law of supply and demand, which fixes the price of wheat and cotton, also fixes the price or purchasing power of real or metallic money. I know that God did not raise up a golden image and fall down before it and worship it, and say to metallic money: "Thou alone art exempt from this universal law of value, determining market prices." Therefore, when three hundred and forty millions of metallic money are being added to the crop of money in the world each year—real money, not promises to pay money, which are no more money than promi-

ses to pay horses are horses—when that has taken place, then resulted the rising scale of prices which we have had for several years.

Mr. BOUTELL. Has not the gentleman lost sight of my question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No, I am leading back to your question.

Mr. BOUTELL. Sixteen to 1; that is the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am leading back to 16 to 1. Now, I have no doubt of the fact also that when the great wars took place in England—and all historians have come to that conclusion—that the Stuarts had historical precedents for a great many of their actions—but no English statesman would discuss, except academically, the issues of the days of the Stuarts.

Mr. BOUTELL rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am going to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BOUTELL. I am going to help the gentleman out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No, you are not. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELL. I am; I withdraw my question. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I decline; I am about to answer it. I have no doubt of that proposition. I have no doubt of several other things that have come about in this world and have passed away. I have no doubt of this fact, that parties do not make issues, but that conditions make issues, and issues make parties, and that the time and circumstances immediately antecedent to and accompanying the time and circumstances make conditions. Now, then, it is not left for any man nor any party to make a platform which shall be a real issue; time and circumstances and conditions make it, and the conditions which I have outlined have been such that the silver question is relegated to the rear. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. May I ask the gentleman a question right there?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (continuing). Now, mind you, I am not saying what will be in any platform in the land; that is not my business. The gentleman has asked me a question as a Representative on this floor, and I have answered it as a Representative from the Eighth district of Mississippi—as plain Mr. WILLIAMS, standing simply in his own poor, plain shoes, answering for nobody but himself. [Applause.]

Mr. BOUTELL. May I say that I expected the gentleman from Mississippi would give just that answer, and I congratulate him on that conclusion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the House will excuse me a moment for uttering a little language perhaps in the minds of some of you almost traitorous; when I go back and study the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, and the debates in the Constitutional Convention, and the history of the time when some of the people in New England threatened to secede—the Hartford convention times—when neither Thomas Jefferson nor James Madison denied that they had no right to do it, if they chose, and when I take all that and the Constitution as I find it, I believe as an academic and historical proposition that my old grandfather, in his day, was right in saying that a State had a technical, constitutional right to secede, but I am not fool enough to be raising that issue right now. [Great applause.] Moreover, if I did raise it, and either party indorsed it, nobody but the platform makers would pay any attention to it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I understood the gentleman to say that prosperity for the last few years had been largely due to the increased production of gold continuously for a few years. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks it would have any effect on his argument to remember that during the African-Boer war the Transvaal mines were closed, and that there has been a reduction in the output of gold during these years of increased prosperity, so that the argument of the gentleman falls to the ground.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have put into the RECORD, in a speech that will come out to-morrow, which I made the other day, clippings, showing that approximately as long as the annual crop of gold kept up, the annual increase of productive enterprise and the scale of rising prices went on. I did not put them there for that purpose, however.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Then, why does it not fall when your production goes down?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It does soon after. Prices are beginning to go down, and have been going down for a year.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The amount of gold is now rising.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I know that, and it will probably soon brace things up; but the effect can not be counted the minute the gold is gotten out of the mine. Does not the gentle-

man know that the crop of anything does not count until it begins to get into the market? The amount of gold that was mined last year did not affect the price last year, nor even this year as yet hardly. It takes some time for it to go where it is coined and minted, and it takes time to distribute it from the mint among the people, where it begins to constitute a part of the effective demand for products. Nor is there any exact mathematical relationship between supply and demand in wheat, cotton, gold, or anything else, because after all it is a correlation, not of the actual supply and actual demand, but of the estimated supply and estimated demand—the estimate going all over the world.

Now, then, the gentleman said that we worshiped another fetich, and he said that fetich was our opposition to the annexation and retention of the Philippine Islands. Well, if that be a fetich, if anticolonialism be an idol, George Washington not only worshiped it but fought for it; and if Jefferson wrote for it, and Patrick Henry spoke for it, and the men at Valley Forge starved for it, and the men at Kings Mountain killed Ferguson for it, and the men at Guilford's Courthouse ran over the British dragoons for it, and the Democratic party has not quit it yet [Applause on the Democratic side], if colonialism is another thing you want to "stand pat" on, stand pat, then, on your un-American, old European, military-camp, grab-nation policy of indefinite colonialism. What are you going to do about this Philippine question, anyhow? Why, I see there is some hedging beginning already.

I saw not long ago that some prominent gentleman, I think it was Professor Schurman, said that Mr. McKinley had told him that he never had any idea of permanently retaining the Philippine Islands; that he just wanted to carry them through a sort of kindergarten process and turn them loose after a while; but if you want to stand pat upon the proposition of indefinite colonialism in the Philippines—if you want to stand pat upon the proposition of killing human beings then and there, or thereafter, or hereafter, in order to "do business,"—then God help you! And only the infinite mercy of God could help you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It reminds me of a story I heard about old Meredith P. Gentry, in Tennessee. He had run for governor or something and been defeated by Andrew Johnson. He was an old-line Whig and quite an aristocrat in his way. He had a contempt for Johnson, and when Johnson defeated him he felt badly, not so much because he had been run over, but because, as the boys said, he "had been run over by that calf." He went into a state of decline, and soon after that his wife died and Gentry became more and more melancholy until finally a lot of old-line Whigs around Knoxville concluded to invite him to Knoxville to the house of old Dr. Sandy Williams, and have a party of friends meet him there and have a nice time and make him forget his sorrows.

They got Gentry there, and among others of the old-line Whigs who came was Parson Brownlow, one of the uncles of the gentleman who now represents an East Tennessee district. Parson Brownlow was "powerful in prayer," as they say down South, and in those days the gentlemen had their long-necked demijohns with their whisky, and they drank until pretty late at night. Then they would have prayers, because they all belonged to the church and were religious. Late at night old Sandy Williams, who was the host upon the occasion, said: "Gentlemen, you know it is the custom in my house, whenever there is a minister of the gospel present, to have prayers before we retire. Brother Brownlow will now (in the words of the Speaker), 'lead us in prayer.'" [Laughter.]

Thereupon Brother Brownlow, who was powerful in prayer, arose. He prayed for the rich and for the poor. He prayed for the ignorant and for the learned. He prayed for this country and for all countries, and especially prayed for the beloved Commonwealth of Tennessee. Then he began to pray for his friends and the friends of those who were there, and then he touched upon Meredith P. Gentry's case and prayed for him, that God might send a salve to heal the wounds that had been wrought in him and close up the gaps that had been made in his political constitution. He prayed for Gentry very pathetically and eloquently. All of the gentlemen had had their toddies, and Gentry was kneeling down by the sofa and could be heard audibly to sob as Brownlow referred to the fact that his good wife, one of the sweetest woman in Tennessee, had died a short time before, and referred to the beautiful relationship between them, the fact that she had gone and left him comfortless at the very hour when he most needed her.

Then the parson expanded and began to pray for everything; and he finally said, "And, O Lord, if in Thy infinite mercy it be possible, have mercy also upon Andrew Johnson and John M. Savage." Then it was that Meredith P. Gentry, great man and great statesman as he was, arose with the tears streaming down his face and said, "Stop, Mr. Brownlow, stop; you will exhaust

the fount of infinite mercy." [Prolonged laughter.] And sometimes when I feel like praying to God to have mercy upon you all in this new pathway of colonialism, recklessness, land robbery, and greed that you have marked out for yourselves under the guise of carrying the white man's burden and introducing "civilization," by gunshot wounds, into the brown man's home, I am almost afraid to pray for fear it may be blasphemous, in that it might possibly exhaust the fount of infinite mercy. [Prolonged applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

But my friend, whose hatred of Thomas Jefferson is so amusing, says that Thomas Jefferson on August 25 and November 25, 1775, wrote letters in which he said that America would rather be dependent upon Great Britain than upon any other government, and indeed would rather be dependent upon Great Britain than upon no government; and he seems to think, student of history as he is—and by the way he is perhaps the man in this House best educated in my opinion upon historical questions—

Mr. BOUTELL. Thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman seems to think that he has discovered a mare's nest. Nobody but a Federalist or a political descendant of a Federalist would be misled that far, my friends. That was in August and November, 1775. It was not very long after the last date when George Washington crossed the Potomac River on his way to the first Congress of the Colonies and being accosted by an old Episcopal rector with the remark, "Mr. Washington, if you all go on with this, it will end in a Declaration of Independence or in a rebellion;" and George Washington's reply substantially was, "I would cut off my arm first." The gentleman will remember also that about that same time Benjamin Franklin told Pitt that "he had never heard independence mentioned by a man in America." In other words, Thomas Jefferson and George Washington and the colonies were driven to desperation and rebellion.

They were trying by every means within their power to get Great Britain to reconsider her idea of undefined and unlimited colonialism in America—her idea of subjecting people subject to the flag of Great Britain upon the continent of America to one law, while people subject to the flag of Great Britain in the islands of Great Britain were subject to another. They were pleading first as loyal subjects against a system the exact forerunner of what you are now practicing under the flag of the Union in the Philippines. They pleaded; they prayed most humbly; they sent up appeal after appeal to King and to Parliament. They would rather have remained with Great Britain; they would rather have been dependent upon her than any other country; they would rather have been dependent upon her than upon no country. British soldiers coming over here had joined with the Colonial troops led by George Washington in Virginia, and led by others in New England, and they had fought side by side against the French and the Indians for the maintenance of the supremacy of the English-speaking race upon the continent of America.

Every liberty that America prized most highly had come down from the English common law. Nearly every drop of blood in the veins of American citizens at that time was English—Cromwellian or Stuart, or whatever may have been the line of political demarcation in the old country. They were anxious to remain under the flag; they were anxious to do it provided they could do it with honor and provided the protection of the flag could be equal, and justice could be dealt out to them. They would have been subjects of Great Britain to-day but for the fact that King George III anticipated on the part of Great Britain the sort of infernal policy that you are now applying to the Philippine Islands, and with obstinacy equal to yours persisted in it. The only difference is that he met a strong and virile people and failed, while you have met a weak and inferior race, who have succumbed. I beg your pardon, there is another difference; English tyranny in America never compared in actual virulence, oppression, and greed to your tyranny in the Philippines. There is another yet; it frankly confessed that it proposed to exploit America; in the interest of British trade and empire, and hid behind no hypocritical pretense of oppression for the sake of the oppressed, "bearing the white man's burden," or "benevolent assimilation."

I do not want to retain or annex any people whom we can not really assimilate, and you can not assimilate any inferior race with whom you will not intermarry. That is the real test of a real assimilation.

Mr. BOUTELL. Will the gentleman yield a moment? Of course, Thomas Jefferson thought that a continued union with Great Britain under such circumstances did not amount to much. I was simply referring to that by way of explanation—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But you said I was always praising him, and you wanted to attack me on that ground.

Mr. BOUTELL. I was referring to the position of Jefferson when he favored dependence—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow me

to finish the line of remark in which I was engaged? I fear I shall lose the train of thought.

Mr. BOUTELL. I thought that in that same connection it might be well to put in the name of that other distinguished son of the Old Dominion, Patrick Henry, as well as the names of Alexander Hamilton and Sam Adams, who did not want dependence on Great Britain on any terms whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. When Patrick Henry, "the tongue of the Revolution," introduced his celebrated resolutions into the Virginia house of burgesses, which were voted through, and two of which were reconsidered the next day, it was young Thomas Jefferson, who subsequently proved "the pen of the Revolution," who was standing at the door of the house and cheered the orator to the echo.

It was Thomas Jefferson, this man whom you try to decry, who had the courage always to draw state papers during that controversy, that always went too far for George Washington and the Lees and the Pendletons and Dickersons and Witherspoons and the Franklins and the balance of them. Not a paper of his was ever rejected because it did not go far enough; several of them were rejected because they went too far. Conservative men thought his positions too advanced, and when he saw and advocated the necessity of a total independence of Great Britain but few others went so far. To do him justice, old Samuel Adams was one who was abreast with him, if not in advance of him.

They talk about Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Chairman. They have got on my hobby now. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] A distinguished accidental incumbent at the other end of an avenue in this city has gone so far as to speak of him as having been cowardly. A coward! A man who dared confess a disbelief in the divinity of Christ and be a candidate for the Presidency in the eighteenth century? A coward! The man who dared drag up by the roots primogeniture and entail against the opposition of all of the old Virginia aristocracy in the Virginia House of Burgesses, against the protests of the Pendletons and the Randolphs and the Lees and the Washingtons and the Harrisons and I believe the Careys and nearly all the balance of them. A coward!

The American President who threw down the gauntlet to Napoleon the Great and informed him of the fact that if the Mississippi River fell into the hands of France it would be a cause of unending conflict between the two nations; who dared say to him, "The only natural enemy of the United States is the owner of the Mississippi Valley;" and who dared to send word to our minister that the emperor must be told plainly that that sort of possession would not be permitted. A coward! The man who dared—why, he was morally one of the most courageous men that ever lived—the man who dared face my Church, the Church of England, and disestablish it in the State of Virginia. A coward!

The man who dared to trust human nature so far that when he built the first elective school university in the world, down here at Charlottesville, Va., which he had named the University of Virginia, dared base it upon self-government amongst the boys themselves, giving no professor or any other body outside of the class room the right to control them, except the officers of the law, telling them to be guided by their honor, and giving them as a maxim "Be free and ye shall be wise."

Oh, this hatred, this old federalistic relic of hatred of Thomas Jefferson would be pathetic if it was not amusing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois had something to say about my definition of a tariff. I need not repeat it. I will stand by it, and I will stand by the fact, too, that the only way in which you can create an industry under the tariff is by deflecting into that industry, which without law would be unprofitable, labor and capital engaged in other industries, which without law would be profitable, and that this sort of creation of industries merely amounts to a change of men and dollars from one business to another.

Why, the gentleman has this morning dwelt upon the prosperity of the South, and what has caused it. He told about the great buildings that were going up in Kansas City, in Jacksonville, and all over Dixie land, and he might have added, all over many other parts of this country. Let me ask him now, and let him answer, if he can, what the protective tariff had to do with that, except this, that it increased the price of structural iron and structural steel, and made the process of building less in volume and slower in time?

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Mississippi know that the tariff on structural steel under the Dingley act is less than it was under the Wilson-Gorman bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the answer to my question is the same old dodge; two boys get together and one of them wants to fight the other, and the other looks like he wants to fight, but finally one of them grows into a little bit of a lack of confidence upon the proposition and says, "Let us talk about that fight we had last week." [Laughter.]

If the tariff upon structural steel and iron was higher in the Wilson-Gorman bill than it was under the Dingley bill, and I frankly confess that I do not know whether it was or not—

Mr. BOUTELL. Well, it was, a little.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And I equally frankly confess that I do not care; it is merely a proof that that is one more place where Democrats made a mistake, that is all.

Mr. BOUTELL. And that they would make just the same mistakes if they were in power again.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On the contrary. Oh, we have made many mistakes. The only difference between you and us is that we confess them and you never do. [Laughter.]

And another thing, Mr. Chairman. At the time that the Wilson-Gorman bill went into effect there was, from a protectionist's standpoint, some need for protection upon these things. Now to-day they are shipping these very things to the markets of the world outside of America, selling wherever they are not shut out by foreign tariffs in competition with the world's "pauper labor," thereby proving that they have no need of the duty at all, unless they need it for the purpose of extorting higher prices from the home consumer.

Now, the gentleman tells us about the railroads everywhere, and that the earnings of the railroads have increased. Now, I want to call his attention to the peculiar conditions in this respect under Republican administration. The earnings have increased about 33½ per cent, he says. I take these figures to be accurate, although I have not looked up the figures.

Mr. BOUTELL. That is the increase in the railroad earnings in the localities referred to in the papers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand that, but there has been an increase throughout the country so far as that is concerned. Now, I read the head lines from the Chicago Chronicle in your own city dated October 18:

[Chicago Chronicle, October 18, 1903.]

Railroad stops all work—Pennsylvania sees hard times coming and economizes—Thousands of men on extension contracts to be dismissed—Traffic outlook does not warrant further expenditures—Nearly \$10,000,000 worth of improvements will shut down November 10.

So the workmen are not getting the earnings. There are a good many of these things I will not read, though they will be found in the RECORD in connection with the speech made the other day. Here is a special telegram from Cleveland, October 17: [Special telegram.]

CLEVELAND, OHIO, October 17, 1903.

Following on the heels of the cut in the force of workmen at the shops of the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railroad all over the country comes the annual announcement to-day that, beginning Monday, there will be a reduction in the working hours of a day from ten to nine hours in all the locomotive and repair shops of the Lake Shore company.

This means a reduction in wages not only in the big shops in Collinwood, but also in Chicago, Pittsburg, and other large cities entered by that line. The Lake Erie and Western, a branch of the Lake Shore, is included in the order.

At the headquarters here to-day it was stated that there was not enough work on hand to keep the large forces busy and the reduction in hours was thought to be the best thing to do.

The announcement has caused consternation among the hundreds of workmen in and around Cleveland.

And this telegram from Philadelphia:

PHILADELPHIA, October 20, 1903.

Forestalling action on the part of the 14,000 trainmen on its lines east of Pittsburg in case of a point blank refusal to comply with the demands of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the Pennsylvania Railroad has already made an important move to prevent trouble. As the most forcible object lesson that could be brought to bear upon the men thousands of employees have been laid off, and orders have been issued that the cutting down shall be from 5 per cent of the total force in some departments to 15 per cent in others. Not less than 6,500, and probably 7,500 men will be discharged or suspended as soon as the lists can be made up. This scaling down will fall heavily upon the trainmen, whose demands for shorter hours are now before the officers of the road. By laying off men the railroad will cut down its monthly pay roll between \$350,000 and \$400,000. High officers of the railroad frankly say that the demands of the trainmen can not be granted. The company, irritated, according to the statements of its officers, by frequent demands on the part of its men, will resolutely refuse to yield an inch.

[From New York Post, October 17, 1903.]

REDUCTION IN RAILWAY FORCES—WHAT THIS WEEK'S ANNOUNCEMENTS MEAN—A REMINISCENCE OF A DECADE AGO—VIEWS OF RAILWAY OFFICERS—EFFECT OF THE ECONOMIES—WHY THE STEP WAS TAKEN.

Steps taken during the week by several of the larger railway systems toward reducing the number of workmen employed, attracted attention in both financial and railroad circles throughout the country. According to report the railroads of the country will lay off between 15,000 and 20,000 men before January 1, 1904, including 2,500 to be discharged by the New York Central, 1,500 by the Pennsylvania, and an equal number by the Atchison. Union Pacific will dispense with 3,000, the Illinois Central with 1,800, Lake Shore 1,000, Rock Island and San Francisco between 1,000 and 1,500, New Haven 1,000, Michigan Central 500, and Lake Erie and Western 300. These are the rough and unofficial showings.

SAN FRANCISCO, October 12, 1903.

An order for retrenchment on a scale unknown before in the history of the Southern Pacific has gone forth from General Manager Kruttschnitt's office. Within a few days between 250 and 300 men will be discharged from the various positions along the Coast division, and the service of a proportionate number on the other lines running out of this city will be dispensed with. In all it is expected that the present force of men in the employ of the road on its California lines will be decreased at least 1,200.

One of the first moves made was to consolidate the position of two train dispatchers and a train master on the narrow-gauge system, throwing all the duties of the three places on the shoulders of the latter official, thus saving to the company the salaries of two dispatchers. Then the positions of traveling conductors along the divisions were scratched off the pay roll. Next the recently created positions of train agents were abolished. In the maintenance-of-way department it was decided to lay off 100 men employed on the construction of the double track south of the city. The carpenter force in the local shops of the same department was next to suffer, 35 men being laid off. Then an order went out dismissing various assistants along the coast route. Even the night station agents, whose duty it is to report trains as they pass in the night, were dispensed with.

Some weeks ago a large force of men was discharged from the shops at Sacramento and several in the repair shops in this city are slated to go.

The reduction of the force on the other branches of the western system is proportionately as large as that on the coast division.

[Special to the World.]

BIG LAY OFF PREDICTED—VANDERBILT OFFICIALS SAY OTHER SYSTEMS WILL REDUCE FORCE.

PHILADELPHIA, October 12, 1903.

Early and large reductions in the number of employees of the big railroad systems of the country are predicted by officials of the Vanderbilt lines.

Announcement was made to-day that 1,500 New York Central and West Shore Railroad shophands will be laid off.

When asked whether the Pennsylvania Railroad has materially reduced the number of men on its pay roll or contemplate such action, General Manager Atterbury said:

"We have not reduced our force very much, and only as the exigencies of the service have required."

No men have been laid off yet by the Philadelphia and Reading Railway, whose traffic continues heavy. When a curtailment comes, if it does, it is likely to be in the shops and among the track hands first.

FIVE HUNDRED LAID OFF AT BUFFALO AND DEPEW.

BUFFALO, October 12, 1903.

Following the order to reduce the force of shopmen on the Vanderbilt system, about 500 employees have been discharged here and at Depew.

[Boston Transcript, October 14, 1903.]

RAILROADS REDUCING FORCES—ABOUT 20,000 MEN SOON TO BE DISCHARGED.

NEW YORK, October 14, 1903.

Several railroad companies have announced reductions in their working force, and it is expected that between now and November 1 nearly every railroad in this country will discharge some of its employees. Such action, it is explained, is not unusual at this time of year, but a larger number of men will be dismissed this fall because the railroad companies have been working abnormally large forces since early last spring. A natural falling off in traffic is the reason generally assigned for these railroad dismissals.

Basing their estimates on the reductions already announced experienced railroad men say that between 15,000 and 20,000 men will probably be laid off by the railroads throughout the country this fall. There are about 1,250,000 railroad employees in the United States.

Vice-President Brown of the New York Central thinks that about 2,500 men may be dropped from the pay rolls of that system this month. The greater proportion of the dismissals will be from the car shops.

About 1,500 shopmen, train men, and trackmen will be discharged on the Pennsylvania system. Vice-President Pugh says that most of the men to be dismissed will be recent employees who were hired during the rush period of last spring. Few, if any, of the old employees of the Pennsylvania system are to be discharged, and no important work of improvement is to be suspended.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe operating department will lay off about 500 men this month, and such improvements as can wait will be deferred until next year.

Not less than 3,000 employees will be dispensed with on the Union Pacific and the Southern Pacific systems between now and December 1. These dismissals, it is said, are to be made because the work for which the men were hired is completed. It is probable that all of the transcontinental lines will cut down their working forces some after the crop shipments are over. The falling off in ore shipments has caused some of the western roads to take off about 10 per cent of their freight trains.

The Illinois Central will curtail its operating force anywhere from 600 to 800 men, and the Chicago and Alton will also make a small reduction.

President Ingalls of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis system says that at present there is a great volume of traffic over his lines, but he expects that it will be necessary to let some of his employees go as soon as the present rush slackens. The Lake Shore will dismiss nearly 1,000 men this month, and the Michigan Central about half that number. About 300 of the Lake Erie and Western employees will be laid off on November 1.

The Erie management has already dismissed several hundred men from the repair shops and the operating force, and there will be a still further reduction between now and December 1. The West Shore will lay off about 300 men, and the Boston and Albany an equal number. A gradual reduction in the operating force of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad is now under way, and before the pruning knife is laid away about 1,000 employees of this company will be out of work.

The Missouri Pacific and other Gould lines will reduce their working forces slightly, but there is to be no cessation in works of extension and improvement. The Wabash expects to increase, rather than diminish, the number of its employees on Pennsylvania improvements.

The Rock Island and the Frisco systems will lay off between 1,000 and 1,500 men this month and next.

[Boston Transcript, October 12, 1903.]

VANDERBILT LINES RETRENCH—ABOUT 1,500 MEN IN SHOPS ON VARIOUS ROADS DROPPED—SAVING OF \$3,000 A DAY.

NEW YORK, October 12, 1903.

Orders have been issued from here whereby 15 per cent of the employees in the car shops, repair shops, and roundhouses of the entire Vanderbilt railway system will be dropped. One thousand five hundred men will be thrown out of employment and a saving of nearly \$3,000 a day will be effected.

The order, which embraces employees of the New York Central and all subsidiary lines going out of New York, the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern, the Lake Erie and Western, and other roads, will have its effect in more than 100 shops and roundhouses. It will take 300 men out of the New York

Central shops at West Albany, N. Y.; as many more from Depew, N. Y., near Buffalo; a hundred or more from Elkhart, Ind., and Collinwood, Ohio, where the Lake Shore has its shops, and several score from the Lake Erie shops at Lima, Ohio. Besides this, on every division of the entire system where round-house mechanics, wipers, oilers, and laborers are employed, 15 per cent of them must go.

[From the New York World, October 22, 1903.]

DON'T SHARE IN PROSPERITY—RAILROAD LAYS OFF 200 MEN WHILE BUSINESS NEVER WAS SO GOOD.

ALBANY, October 21, 1903.

Notice was given to-day that the Delaware and Hudson Railroad Company will lay off 200 men, equivalent to 10 per cent of the working force.

Second Vice-President Culver said to-day that increased efficiency of administration, and not industrial depression or labor troubles, was the cause of the reduction.

The road was doing the largest business in its history, he said, but it had been found that the work could be done with a reduced force.

I have never had any doubt that the capitalists got something out of your favoritism.

Mr. BOUTELL. In Mississippi the laboring people are prospering.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes. And they are laboring people who sweat while they plow raising cotton in the field in direct competition with the pauper labor of India and with the fellows of Egypt, and do not ask a bit of prop-up from the Federal Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And they are the people in the factories of Mississippi who are making the heavy-weight cotton goods that are shipped to China and Manchuria, and will continue to be shipped to Manchuria unless the Republican Administration allows Russia to close its ports, a thing I very much fear at the present. They have been able to sell that product in China and Manchuria independently of your tariff, although a tariff does exist upon that class of goods. That tariff can not affect the price for those goods in a foreign market.

So it seems that these railroads get the earnings, and not the men working on the railroads. Whenever they want to get higher wages they are locked out, and when they do not ask for higher wages they are reduced.

Now, I will not read any more of these. So much in answer to the proposition that the railroads' earnings have increased 33 1/2 per cent. Now, let me show the immense difference between increasing the aggregate wealth of a country and increasing the real prosperity of the people of the same country.

There may be an increased prosperity of the people accompanying an increase in the aggregate wealth, and there may not be. It depends upon how the aggregate wealth is distributed, if every man gets his due share. And if in this great prosperity capital gets an undue share and labor gets no part or parcel or tithe in the movement then you have not got a happy condition for the people, although figures may show great increase of wealth in the aggregate. It is a curious fact that to-day the most prosperous parts of the American Union are the agricultural portions, that protection can not help, because they export their products; and the portions of the country that are beginning to feel distress and what threatens to be a gradual depression are in New Jersey, New York, New England, and Pennsylvania, where many businesses are dependent upon a protective tariff to a very large extent.

Now the gentleman refers to Croker. I will not go into the Croker business, but I can say this with a perfectly clear conscience, that Philadelphia under Republican rule has furnished a thousand Crokers to where New York under Democratic rule has furnished one, and not a single Philadelphia Croker was ever refused admittance into polite society. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. And St. Louis has furnished an ex-prize fighter and saloon keeper and boss as a delegate to the national convention.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; though I do not know so much about St. Louis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I asked the other day if you would "stand pat" on a number of things. I will not ask you if you will "stand pat" on your candidate, because I know you have to whether you want to or not.

Now, I hold in my hand an article from the Washington Post of Thursday, December 10, which is quoted from the New York Evening Post, and is a summary of the report of Treasurer Shaw.

I have not the voice and lungs nor strength to read it, but I am going to insert it in the RECORD, and I am going to ask you whether you are going to stand pat upon the self-confessed extravagance in the Treasury Department pointed out by your own Secretary of the Treasury; whether you are not going to examine into it through some of these numerous committees upon expenditures in the several departments, and whether if there is anything wrong going on you are going to correct it? Your Secretary says there is wrong. He says there is glaring extravagance which ought to be corrected, and yet he has done nothing under the sun to correct it, and Congress has not taken any part in it.

That is one of the other things I want to ask you whether you are going to "stand pat" upon.

EXTRAVAGANCE CONFESSED—AWKWARD FINANCIAL FACTS PRESENTED IN SECRETARY SHAW'S ANNUAL REPORT.

[From the New York Evening Post.]

If the Democrats are wise they will print Secretary Shaw's annual report as a campaign document. Mr. Shaw is a staunch Republican, but circumstances have compelled him to present the financial situation to the country in a way that is most awkward for his party on the eve of a Presidential election. His report is a model in its way. It states the operations of the year with business-like exactness. It contains but few recommendations, and as a whole these will meet with general approval. And there is only an irreducible minimum of good Republican phraseology.

We are told that, in reforming the currency, "no measure should be considered that will in anywise weaken what is now stable, and no element should be injected that will cause distrust or doubt." If this statement is what the Prayer Book calls a work of supererogation, the same can not be said of Secretary Shaw's allusion to the present condition of the stock market. The "enormous and inconceivable shrinkage" in securities he traces ultimately to "the natural optimism of our people." This does not sound like the pure milk of Republicanism. Whoever before heard a leading spokesman of the party imply that optimism is a dangerous thing?

The striking feature of the report is, however, its evidence of gross extravagance in the conduct of the Government. It shows that while the receipts increased about \$10,000,000 over the previous year, expenditures increased about \$47,000,000. But that is the smallest part of the showing. Despite the fact just cited, there was a surplus for the year of over \$54,000,000, whereas for the next few years it is extremely likely that the balance will be on the wrong side of the ledger. To be sure, a surplus of \$14,000,000 is figured for 1904; but we have to compare this with the estimate of nearly \$52,000,000 for that period which Secretary Shaw presented a year ago. Certainly, if the receipts and expenditures maintain the same relation for the remainder of the present fiscal year that has been witnessed so far, the Secretary's \$14,000,000 surplus will "fit like a ghost away."

When he comes to his 1905 estimates, the Secretary frankly admits a deficit of \$23,000,000. This is, of course, a purely arbitrary figure; the real shortage will as likely as not greatly exceed this sum. It may be tolerably easy to calculate expenditures two years ahead, but under our revenue laws the Secretary of the Treasury is all at sea when he comes to forecasting his receipts. He may believe that he can call spirits from the vasty deep, but will they come when he doth call for them? A year or two of even moderate industrial depression would be apt to knock Mr. Shaw's 1905 revenue calculations into a cocked hat; the same may be true even of his 1904 figures.

With this contingency staring it in the face, the nation is confronted with an increase of \$87,000,000 in its annual outgo between 1903 and 1905. And the astonishing thing is that the Administration has embarked on this extravagance with its eyes open. It estimates that it will collect about \$31,000,000 more in 1905 than in 1904; and then, in cold blood, it arranges to increase its expenditures nearly \$67,000,000, knowing that it will thus create a deficit of \$23,000,000. Secretary Shaw's figures show that the Navy and the Postal Service are to be the chief beneficiaries of this extravagance. The Navy took \$67,800,000 in 1902 and \$82,600,000 in 1903; in 1904 it will absorb \$96,000,000, and in 1905 it is down for nearly \$104,000,000. The Postal Service got \$134,200,000 in 1903; in 1904 it will take \$144,700,000, and in 1905 \$168,000,000. The expediency of building ships and docks and enlarging the rural delivery at this rate, with hard times and falling revenues confronting us, may well be doubted.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Shaw will not soon be exchanging condolences with ex-Secretary Foster. The people did not like the monthly deficits which the latter was obliged to report in 1892, and they decided to replace President Harrison with Mr. Cleveland, despite the former's approval of optimism and his hatred of cheapness. Now, \$25,000,000 is a very narrow estimate for an annual surplus, especially when the shrinkage in imports since September 1, 1903, is kept in mind. To forecast no more than that amount is, in existing circumstances, tantamount to a confession of a deficit. It looks as if the Administration may have to fall back on the accumulated surplus, and declare that one or two annual deficits need not bother anybody. In the matter of accumulated surplus, the Republicans of 1903 apparently have a great advantage over those of 1892.

But of the \$219,000,000 on hand over \$158,000,000 is deposited in the national banks; and it was left there chiefly for the purpose of keeping the general financial and industrial situation from coming to harm. To withdraw it in any amount at a time like this might be worse for the Administration than no surplus at all. Add to this \$158,000,000 the \$50,000,000 required to indemnify the French Panama Canal Company and "our sister Republic" on the Isthmus, and there is not much left of the surplus. Clearly, the Republican party will be skating on thin ice to enter a Presidential campaign with such a treasury showing as this. The 1904 expenditures must be regarded as fixed, but it looks suicidal in the Administration deliberately to flaunt such estimates as it has prepared for 1905 in the face of the people. Here at least there was a chance for amendment or for urging retrenchment. But Ephraim is apparently joined to his idols.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I owe the House, and especially my own side, a little apology, I think, for undertaking to answer so ornate, elaborate, and well prepared an argument in such an offhand and stringy sort of way; but I have such absolute confidence in the eternal righteousness of Democratic policies, purposes, and principles that I always wade in like David with his miserable little sling no matter if Goliath is prearmed and panoplied in helmet or not, trusting to God and truth for the result.

[Great and prolonged applause.]

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TAWNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10954, the urgent deficiency bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—CONNELL VS. HOWELL.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 3 I present a privileged report and resolutions in the contested-election case of Connell v. Howell, from the Tenth Congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania, and ask that this be referred to the House Calendar and printed, and I further wish to give notice that it will be called up for consideration one week from next Friday, the 5th day of February.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a report from the Committee on Elections, the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contested-election case of Connell v. Howell (Tenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania).

The SPEAKER. It will be referred to the House Calendar and printed.

Mr. McLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that the minority is to have until Monday to file the minority report.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes; we have agreed on that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the minority have until Monday next to file their report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I give notice it will be called up for consideration one week from next Friday—

Mr. TAWNEY. One moment more, Mr. Speaker. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York if he expects a vote to be taken within a day or two after it is called up? If he does, I would suggest to him to place the time for consideration earlier in the week, either that week or the following week, as the gentleman well knows it is almost impossible to keep the House here on Friday and Saturday.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I wish to withdraw that notice, then, and will give notice to-morrow morning of the time when we wish to call it up.

REPRINT OF URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the urgent deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the urgent deficiency bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that more time has been consumed this afternoon than was expected, I ask that the time for general debate on the urgent deficiency bill be extended for three hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the urgent deficiency bill be extended three hours.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one question before that. I suppose, of course, it is the intention if there is any inequality between the two sides as to time that our side shall be compensated by the new time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We have thirty minutes of the old time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. R. 32. Joint resolution to fill vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. 1334. An act granting an increase of pension to Amy C. Bosworth;

S. 1437. An act granting an increase of pension to Clarence E. Bullard;

S. 959. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Ranard;

S. 1498. An act granting an increase of pension to Winslow P. Eayrs;

S. 1497. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter F. Chase;

S. 1491. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Hoover;

S. 1429. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Paquin;

S. 1402. An act granting an increase of pension to William Paul;

S. 1335. An act granting an increase of pension to Calvin Daws;

S. 1259. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Stanyan;

S. 1559. An act granting an increase of pension to Marie A. Rask;

S. 1825. An act granting a pension to Josephine L. Webber;

S. 1826. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cutts;

S. 1938. An act granting an increase of pension to Aldredge Patterson;

S. 1827. An act granting an increase of pension to Harris A. P. Lewis;

S. 9. An act granting an increase of pension to David E. Burbank;

S. 814. An act granting a pension to Mamie Thayer;

S. 821. An act granting an increase of pension to W. Neil Denison;

S. 847. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Beveridge;

S. 898. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Carter;

S. 929. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Sterner;

S. 555. An act granting an increase of pension to Royal A. S.

Kingsley;

S. 565. An act granting an increase of pension to James E.

Barnard;

S. 930. An act granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand

Wiedemann;

S. 578. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bula-

more;

S. 586. An act granting a pension to Annie H. Zall;

S. 587. An act granting an increase of pension to Anson P.

Williamson;

S. 589. An act granting an increase of pension to George W.

McMullen;

S. 744. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen Gas-

coigne;

S. 745. An act granting a pension to John Swenson;

S. 798. An act granting an increase of pension to James A.

Templeton;

S. 190. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Bell;

S. 451. An act granting an increase of pension to William T.

Conant;

S. 458. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles

Beattie;

S. 452. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert W.

Bullock;

S. 456. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J.

Pierce;

S. 471. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas Meserve;

S. 478. An act granting an increase of pension to Olive J. Bailey;

S. 473. An act granting an increase of pension to Byron D. Bab-

cock;

S. 484. An act granting a pension to Nancy S. Marsh;

S. 547. An act granting an increase of pension to Irving W.

Coombs;

S. 14. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel M.

Perry;

S. 99. An act granting an increase of pension to Joel C. Shep-

herd;

S. 182. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F.

Holt;

S. 12. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis E.

Chase;

S. 13. An act granting an increase of pension to William Clark;

and

S. 937. An act granting an increase of pension to Rudolph

Siebelist.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 3341. An act authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, title 3, of an act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome City, in the Territory of Alaska—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2081. An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1681. An act to provide for the modification of the project for the improvement of Bridgeport Harbor, Bridgeport, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 2261. An act to amend section 4607 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 901. An act providing for the construction of a vessel of the first class for the Revenue-Cutter Service to be stationed with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1748. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 469. An act to restore Henry D. Hall to the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 462. An act to construct and place a light-ship off the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 906. An act to aid in the erection of a statue of Commodore John D. Sloat, United States Navy, at Monterey, Cal.—to the Committee on the Library.

S. 23. An act for the erection of a monument to the memory of John Paul Jones—to the Committee on the Library.

S. R. 9. Joint resolution authorizing the issue of duplicate medals where the originals have been lost or destroyed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 131. An act to provide for the construction and equipment of a revenue cutter for service in Narragansett Bay and adjacent waters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1380. An act to provide for a site for a depot for the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 492. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 711. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, and making appropriation for the same—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1490. An act to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 708. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to authorize the building of a bridge across Thief River, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 270. An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 352. An act for the relief of the representatives of M. F. Merritt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 175. An act for the relief of Robert D. McAfee and John Chiatovich—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 177. An act to reimburse certain persons who expended moneys and furnished services and supplies in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities within the territorial limits of the present State of Nevada—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 334. An act for the relief of N. F. Palmer, jr., & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1451) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor H. Hord; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor withdrawing certain estimates of appropriation—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the heirs of Solomon P. McKinnie against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HASKINS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 113) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the State of Vermont money appropriated by the act of Congress of July 1, 1902, and to adjust mutual claims between the United States and the State of Vermont, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 550); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4674) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 462); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3909) granting an increase of pension to George Hayden, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 463); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2643) granting an increase of pension to Melinda H. Chapman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 464); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9273) granting an increase of pension to James H. Sackett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 465); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2858) granting an increase of pension to Delia B. Stuart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 466); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1689) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Houghton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 467); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Cozine, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 468); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1688) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Bellman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 469); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5610) granting a pension to Annie Dorfner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 470); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2392) granting an increase of pension to William W. Misner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 471); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9633) granting a pension to Margaret Hutcheson Booth, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 472); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4393) granting a pension to Abbie E. Webster, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 473); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 265) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gray, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 474); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Abner B. Edson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 475); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2126) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams, alias Thomas W. Lennox, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 476); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3910) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hoffman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 477); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2128) granting an increase of pension to George A. Seebold, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 478); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1851)

granting an increase of pension to David T. Towles, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 479); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8718) granting a pension to Caswell P. Ford, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 480); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1911) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose W. Severance, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 481); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2548) granting an increase of pension to Emma McFarland, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 482); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4624) granting a pension to Isabella Phelps, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 483); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4679) granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Pierce, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 484); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 980) granting an increase of pension to Mary Von Kusserow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 485); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LUCKING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4180) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Thomas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 486); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2470) granting an increase of pension to Harriet S. Packard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 487); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2496) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Wing, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 488); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2689) granting an increase of pension to David M. Kanouse, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 489); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 910) granting an increase of pension to Freeman York, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 490); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5398) granting a pension to Hiram Parker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 491); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5568) granting an increase of pension to Emily Chapman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 492); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3370) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Addams, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 493); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1428) granting an increase of pension to George Pennington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 494); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 594) granting an increase of pension to Finley T. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 495); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 593) granting an increase of pension to William H. Horn, reported the same without amendment, accom-

panied by a report (No. 496); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 614) granting a pension to Michael O'Brian, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 497); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9060) granting an increase of pension to John Connors, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 498); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9683) granting a pension to Henry Austin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 499); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2298) granting a pension to Patrick J. Conway, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 500); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2223) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Kendall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 501); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9610) granting an increase of pension to Fredrick Halling, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 502); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 926) granting an increase of pension to William S. Campbell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 503); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7239) granting a pension to Lydia M. Hill, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 504); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7418) granting an increase of pension to Peter Minkler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 505); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8079) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. La Forest, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 506); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9376) granting an increase of pension to Martin Reuthler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 507); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 891) granting an increase of pension to Erwin R. Cole, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 508); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 897) granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Frogge, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 509); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6999) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 510); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8303) granting a pension to James M. Hemphill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 511); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6881) to pension Zachariah T. Bryant, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 512); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8992) granting an increase of pension to William C. Davis, reported the same

with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 513); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1947) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Judge, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 514); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2612) granting a pension to Sarah J. Bellamy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 515); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9024) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Laird, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 516); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7236) granting an increase of pension to W. R. McCullough, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 517); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6869) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Elmer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 518); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7382) granting a pension to Ellen A. Harmon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 519); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1953) granting a pension to Susan Fenno, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 520); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8806) for the relief of Avin W. Harper, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 521); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3485) for the relief of Joseph Swisher, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 522); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1280) for the relief of W. J. Warren, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 523); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10533) for the relief of Capt. E. P. Brewer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 524); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9851) for the relief of William T. Ratliff, administrator of the estate of Sarah G. Clark, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 525); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3327) for the relief of Frank Hanson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 526); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 796, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 165) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the owners of the barge *Charlie*, accompanied by a report (No. 528); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 6915, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 166) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mary J. McClothen, accompanied by a report (No. 529); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5371, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 167) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of John L. Seargeant, accompanied by a report (No. 530); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2385, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 168) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Burwell J. Curry, accompanied by a report (No. 531); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7520, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 169) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of W. W. Norris, accompanied by a report (No. 532); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1030, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 170) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of E. A. Best, administratrix of Adaline D. Turner, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 533); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2403, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 171) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of M. H. Carr, accompanied by a report (No. 534); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 9920, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 172) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the heirs of Nancy Montgomery, accompanied by a report (No. 535); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10816, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 173) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mattie P. Barnard, Katharine Caldwell, and Harry M. Rhett, heirs of Harriett M. Barnard, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 536); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2160, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 174) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the personal representative of the estate of Alexander Myers, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 537); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7815, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 175) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the heirs of Robert May and others, accompanied by a report (No. 538); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2408, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 176) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of F. L. Hammond, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 539); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10714, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 177) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Francis M. Sheppard, accompanied by a report (No. 540); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 6068, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 178) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of J. E. Caldwell, accompanied by a report (No. 541); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1613, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 179) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Dan Walden, accompanied by a report (No. 542); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SPIGHT, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10719, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 180) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mrs. G. W. Ross, Mrs. H. C. Cary, Mrs. Annie Brooks, L. C. Wilcoxon, and Willie Wilcoxon, heirs of Wiley Franks, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 543); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10585, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 181) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the vestry of Christ Episcopal Church, of Holly Springs,

Miss., accompanied by a report (No. 544); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1010, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 182) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the heirs of Samuel Ayres, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 545); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2623, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 183) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mrs. Ellen H. Smith, accompanied by a report (No. 546); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1117, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 184) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the trustees of the Methodist Church at Prospect, Giles County, Tenn., accompanied by a report (No. 547), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SPIGHT, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11010, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 185) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the First Baptist Church, Helena, Ark., accompanied by a report (No. 548); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1150, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 186) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case Hiram Lodge, No. 7, of Free and Accepted Masons, of Franklin, Tenn., accompanied by a report (No. 549); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2, Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10561) for the relief of Amos Woodruff, president of the Overton Hotel Company, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 527); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9599) granting a pension to Grace P. Paddock—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5880) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Dunn—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10404) granting a pension to Florence E. Foster—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7985) granting a pension to Alice Jenifer—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 805) granting an increase of pension to George W. McConkey—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5881) granting an increase of pension to William Cary—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 11119) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Shawnee, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11120) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at El Reno, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11121) to appropriate the sum of \$150,000 to erect a public building at Enid, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11122) to amend an act to prohibit the passage of special or local laws in the Territories, to limit the territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11123) for the improvement of White Oak River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 11124) to suppress monopolies or trusts in restraint of trade in cattle, hogs, other animals, or meats—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 11125) to amend section 2 of the act approved March 3, 1879, being an act making appropriations for the payment of arrears of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 11126) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to add to the segregation of coal and asphalt lands in Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11127) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to improve the Des Moines River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 11128) to modify and amend an agreement with the Indians of the Devils Lake Reservation, in North Dakota, to accept and ratify the same as amended, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 11129) to promote commerce, protect shipping, and contribute to the defenses of the harbor and city of New York, by the construction of a canal connecting Long Island Sound and the several bays and waterways to the east, and on the south side of Long Island, with New York Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 11130) to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 11131) to refund to the Territory of Hawaii the amount expended maintaining light-houses and light-house service on its coasts from the time the Territory became United States territory until said light-houses were taken under Government control—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: A bill (H. R. 11132) to establish a light and fog signal at or near Black Ledge, New London Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11133) donating gun carriages to the Connecticut commissioners for the care and preservation of Fort Griswold—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 11134) to modify and amend an agreement with the Red Lake and Pembina bands of Indians of the Red Lake Reservation, in Minnesota, and to ratify the same as amended, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 11135) amending an act approved March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory by the United States, by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea, in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri"—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 11136) to provide for the hearing and determination of contests of the claims of States to swamp land under swamp-land grants—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11137) to grant to homesteaders on the Fort Randall Military Reservation in Boyd County, Nebr., and Gregory County, S. Dak., a second homestead right—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 11138) to increase the efficiency and safety of the mercantile marine of the United States by creating a commission to revise the laws relating to construction, installation, and inspection of marine boilers, to provide uniformity of inspection of marine boilers in the United States and insular possessions, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11139) to require the employment of vessels of the United States for public purposes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11140) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 165) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 796—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 166) re-

ferring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 6915—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 167) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 5371—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 168) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 2385—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 169) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 7520—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 170) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 1030—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 171) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 2403—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 172) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 9920—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 173) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 10816—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 174) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 2160—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 175) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 7815—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 176) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 2408—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 177) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 10714—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 178) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 6068—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 179) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 1613—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SPIGHT, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 180) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 10719—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 181) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 10585—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 182) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 1010—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 183) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 2623—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 184) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 1117—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SPIGHT, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 185) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 11010—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 186) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 1150—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. BAKER: A resolution (H. Res. 188) directing the Judiciary Committee to investigate and report whether, in sending a railroad pass to ROBERT BAKER, a Member of this House, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company was violating the law—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINOR: A resolution (H. Res. 189) taking steps to conserve the fur seal of Alaska—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DRISCOLL, from the Committee on Elections No. 3: A resolution (H. Res. 190) that Hon. George Howell was not elected a Representative in the Fifty-eighth Congress from the Tenth district of the State of Pennsylvania—to the House Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 191) that Hon. William Connell was duly elected a Representative in the Fifty-eighth Congress from the Tenth district of the State of Pennsylvania and is entitled to a seat therein—to the House Calendar.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BADGER: A bill (H. R. 11141) granting an increase of pension to John B. Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 11142) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. L. Groffmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS: A bill (H. R. 11143) for the relief of David K. Wall and the heirs of John A. Witter, deceased—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 11144) granting a pension to Elzie May Camp Bernard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11145) for the relief of George T. Welch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11146) granting an increase of pension to Robert Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11147) to restore David B. Jeffers to the United States Army with the rank of first lieutenant and place him upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11148) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stanfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11149) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11150) granting an increase of pension to Marvin A. Wixson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11151) granting a pension to Eliza M. Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 11152) for the relief of the estate of Oliver Milburn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11153) granting an increase of pension to William D. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11154) granting an increase of pension to William M. Swart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 11155) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11156) for the relief of Mary Leary and children—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 11157) for the relief of Seth Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11158) granting an increase of pension to William W. Hargrave—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11159) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 11160) granting an increase of pension to Randall Denney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 11161) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. William Austine, retired, to the grade of colonel in the United States Army and place him on the retired list as such—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 11162) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Good, deceased, late of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: A bill (H. R. 11163) granting an increase of pension to Azuboth Srofe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 11164) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Winton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 11165) granting a pension to Thompson F. Frisbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 11166) granting a pension to John Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11167) granting an increase of pension to James K. Nickell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 11168) for the relief of Isaac A. Kase—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 11169) granting an increase of pension to Reuben G. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11170) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Paynter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11171) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Whitson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11172) granting an increase of pension to John W. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11173) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11174) granting an increase of pension to Herman J. Watjen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 11175) granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Drummond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 11176) granting an increase of pension to George Lintern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11177) granting an increase of pension to George Manypenny—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 11178) for the relief of Miss Lelia G. Casey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 11179) to increase the pension of William G. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 11180) for the relief of George S. Ayre—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 11181) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to the city of Roswell, N. Mex., for certain tracts of land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 11182) granting an increase of pension to William J. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 11183) for the relief of Marmon Spence Pope—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 11184) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the Congressional case No. 28198, the Washington Loan and Trust Company, legal representative of the estate of Aaron Van Camp, deceased, and Mary M. U. Chapin and Rna P. Chapin, legal representatives of the estate of Virginus P. Chapin, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11185) for the relief of Daniel J. Ockerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11186) granting relief to certain members of the Seventh Michigan Cavalry, war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11187) granting an increase of pension to Fyanna Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 11188) granting an increase of pension to Hanson Bottomstone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11189) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Henry Wilhelm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: A bill (H. R. 11190) for the relief of Henry Finnegas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 11191) granting a pension to Zachariah Minnear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11192) granting an increase of pension to William Seymour Alden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11193) granting an increase of pension to Abbie W. Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11194) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Nickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11195) for the relief of James A. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11196) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Samuel Svenson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11197) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Valentine Kirchner—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11198) granting an increase of pension to James M. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. D. Mitchell and six others, of Union Point, Ga., in favor of the enactment of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Whipple Post, No. 414, Grand Army of the Republic, Kankakee, Ill., in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Hon. A. H. JACKSON, asking for compensation for expenses in the contested-election case of Norton v. Jackson—to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the officers and teachers of the University of Maine, for converting the big-tree groves of California into national parks—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Letter from Woodhouse & Bartley Bank, Bloomington, Wis., in favor of the passage of bill H. R. 5068, relative to the redemption of mutilated United States notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, letter from Wisconsin Banking Association, favoring passage of bill H. R. 5068—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of Grand Army of the Republic Post No. 158, Ontario, Wis.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BADGER: Resolution of Farmers' Institute at Groveport, Ohio, in favor of the enactment of the Brownlow good-roads bill, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Leavenworth Council, No. 76, United Commercial Travelers, relative to amending the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Mound City Council, No. 207, of United Commercial Travelers of America, relative to the amending of the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Paper to accompany House bill to pension C. H. L. Groffmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, against eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, against anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Resolution of E. C. Little Post, No. 54, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., in opposition to the enactment of an eight-hour bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., opposing anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 2574, granting an increase of pension to Elias Riegler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 9355, granting an increase of pension to Byron Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 9354, granting an increase of pension to John Richmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 9362, granting an increase of pension to Stephen Bashaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 9358, granting an increase of pension to Albert D. Davey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 9356, granting an increase of pension to Harvey C. Button—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 10034, granting a pension to Lucinda Vincent—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 2569, granting an increase of pension to Mahlon L. Angle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Charles A. Price Post, No. 405, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Papers to accompany H. J. Res. 89, for the relief of Daniel B. Watts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWIGHT: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to William M. Swart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of Everett Chamber of Commerce, urging an appropriation of \$50,000 to increase the facilities of the Tulalip Indian Reservation school—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Memorial of J. E. Pettit, in favor of bill H. R. 2895, for the relief of telegraph operators who served in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Merchant and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, relative to the improvement of the main ship channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of Randolph Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Tonica, Ill., in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolution of the Gloucester Board of Trade, relative to the restoration of merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the Gloucester Board of Trade, relative to arbitration treaties between the United States and foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Gloucester Board of Trade, relative to the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Gloucester Board of Trade, relative to the destruction of derelicts at sea—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of E. E. Wiley and 26 others, F. J. Fowler and 30 others, Robert Walker and 28 others, and A. P. Bissell and 17 others, of Harriman, Tenn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill to pension Martha J. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany claim of J. T. Cooper—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Randall Denney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Ohio Vicksburg Battlefield Association in favor of the enactment of bill H. R. 5084, providing for a national park commission—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEDGE: Memorial of the Upper Mississippi River Improvement Association, relative to the improvement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Resolutions of Farragut Ransom Post, No. 379; Lenox Post, No. 316; Abe Flick Post, No. 437; John A. Adams Post, No. 195; Shively Post, No. 421; William Dafur Post, No. 297; Frank Nolan Post, No. 208; Rice Post, No. 288; Upton Post, No. 248; Van Wert Post, No. 205; Samuel Sumner Post, No. 398; Sedgwick Post, No. 10; Henry Walton Post, No. 312; Wayne Post, No. 187; Weldon Post, No. 426; McKnight Post, No. 491; Union Post, No. 441, and Osceola Post, No. 173, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: Resolution of Jonathan Casto Post, No. 342, Grand Army of the Republic, of Blanchester, Ohio, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of E. E. Wisby—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOGG: Petition of Grand Junction Ministerial Association, of Colorado, favoring passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Salida (Colo.) Board of Trade, protesting against changes in present land laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic posts No. 63, Department of Colorado and Wyoming; No. 13, of Greeley, Colo.; No. 109, of Meeker, Colo.; No. 16, of Monte Vista, Colo.; No. 31, of Colorado Springs, Colo.; No. 100 and No. 54, of Telluride, Colo., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Resolution of General William S. Truer Post, No. 118, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New Jersey, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of the Reformed Church of Paramus, of Ridgewood, N. J., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Reformed Church of Paramus, of Ridgewood, N. J., for the passage of a bill to prevent nullification of State liquor laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of George G. Meade Post, No. 7, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New Jersey, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of citizens of Blakesburg, Iowa, in favor of the passage of bill H. R. 2895, for the relief of military telegraph operators—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Resolution of the West Pennsylvania Synod of the Lutheran Church, in favor of the Hepburn bill (H. R. 4073)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Petition of C. Zeglen, relative to bullet-proof cloth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill to increase pension of Joseph M. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting increase of pension to Thomas Headdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to increase pension of J. E. Speake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to increase pension of Sarah J. Paynter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: Petitions of W. S. Morgan and 15 others and of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Derrancton, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Simon J. McCann, of Fort Wayne, Ind., in favor of bill providing for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution of the county court of Madison County, Tenn., in favor of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Resolutions of G. H. Ewing Post, No. 203; Steele Brothers Post, No. 441; Dick Richardson Post, No. 147; Dewey Post, No. 60; John and Alfred Ryder Post, No. 404; J. B. McPherson Post, No. 183; Henry H. Knapp Post, No. 284; Fred Walker Post, No. 134; James Bradley Post, No. 194; Governor Crapo Post, No. 145, and Phil. McKernan Post, No. 53, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of C. P. Maxan, of Waterford, Mich., against passage of parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Papers to accompany House bill rela-

tive to the Red Lake and Pembina bands of Chippewa Indians, of Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WADE: Resolution of James Cross Post, No. 292, Grand Army of the Republic, of Millersburg, Iowa, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Resolutions of William Lawrence Post, No. 794, of New Burnside, Ill., and James C. Lasater Post, No. 570, of Millshoals, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Golconda, Ill., against parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 27, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BURROWS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

WALTER B. JORDAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certain information relative to a contract entered into with Walter B. Jordan, of Miles City, Mont., for the delivery at various posts during the fiscal year 1901 of large quantities of provisions for the Indian service, amounting to \$1,289.51, and recommending that he be reimbursed therefor; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PURCHASE OF INDIAN SUPPLIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to purchases made in open market of Indian goods and supplies in excess of \$500, and under exigencies authorized by the Secretary of the Interior during the fiscal year, 1903, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PINE RIDGE AGENCY, S. DAK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting papers from the files of the records of the Indian Department giving the history of the recent encounter between certain Sioux Indians of the Pine Ridge Agency, S. Dak., and the sheriff's posse from Wyoming, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 9) granting an increase of pension to David E. Burbank;
A bill (S. 12) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Chase;
A bill (S. 13) granting an increase of pension to William Clark;
A bill (S. 14) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Perry;

A bill (S. 99) granting an increase of pension to Joel C. Shepherd;

A bill (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holt;
A bill (S. 190) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Bell;

A bill (S. 451) granting an increase of pension to William T. Conant;

A bill (S. 452) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Bullock;

A bill (S. 456) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pierce;

A bill (S. 458) granting an increase of pension to Charles Beattie;

A bill (S. 471) granting an increase of pension to Silas Meserve;

A bill (S. 473) granting an increase of pension to Byron D. Babcock;

A bill (S. 478) granting an increase of pension to Olive J. Bailey;

A bill (S. 484) granting a pension to Nancy S. Marsh;

A bill (S. 547) granting an increase of pension to Irving W. Coombs;

A bill (S. 555) granting an increase of pension to Royal A. S. Kingsley;

A bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to James E. Barnard;